R8825-5.1F 8/88

THE PUBLIC, THE SOVIETS, AND NUCLEAR ARMS

PUBLIC
SUMMIT '88

A JOINT PROJECT OF THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION AND
THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2010:

Americans Look to the Future

A Report of The Public Agenda Foundation and
The Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University

Copyright 1988 by the Public Agenda Foundation,
and the Center for Foreign Policy Development

All rights reserved including the rights
to reproduce this book or portions thereof
in any form.

For reprint information contact either:
The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

OR:

The Center for Foreign Policy Development
P.O. Box 1948
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2010:

Americans Look to the Future

A report of the Public Agenda Foundation and
the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University

By John Doble
Vice President
The Public Agenda Foundation

In Consultation With

Richard Smoke
Director of Research
Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University

AND

Jean Johnson
Vice President and Director of Programs
The Public Agenda Foundation

Public Summit '88 is a nonpartisan education
and communications project designed to help
Americans understand the choices that our
country faces in areas of U.S.-Soviet relations
and nuclear arms.

This project was co-sponsored by:
The Public Agenda Foundation
and
Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development.

THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION

The Public Agenda Foundation is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and education organization, founded in 1975 by former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and public opinion analyst Daniel Yankelovich. Public Agenda works with media and other organizations to develop innovative ways of presenting complex issues to the public.

The Foundation has three types of programs, each designed to bring leadership, media and community groups together in a dialogue that heightens awareness about issues of national and local concern. In media-based public education campaigns, Public Agenda has worked with the media to stimulate open and constructive public debate on choices communities face on critical issues.

Each year, Public Agenda frames three topics for National Issues Forums in a set of issue books, setting down alternatives facing the American people - and their costs - and they are presented in hundreds of public gatherings where citizens can "work through" their different opinions to reach common ground.

Finally, independent research projects are undertaken to understand not only what people think about complex issues, but why they think it: these projects use a variety of research techniques renging from focused group discussions to full-scale national opinion studies.

THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY STUDIES

The Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, is a nonprofit organization established in 1981 on the initiative of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Chairman Emeritus of IBM Corporation. Its mandate is to engage in research on U.S. policy for dealing with the Soviet Union and related weapons issues.

The Center brings together scholars, practitioners, and politicians and the public in a search for policy choices that can lead to consensus on the best way to reduce the risk of nuclear war while defending basic American values and interests.

The Center is separately incorporated but affiliated with Brown University and its newly-established Institute for International Studies. It is funded by grants from private individuals and foundations.

PROJECT FUNDERS

Funding for The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms has been provided by the following institutions:

The Bohen Foundation

The Carnegie Corporation

The Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation

The George Gund Foundation

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The Charles F. Kettering Foundation

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

The James C. Penney Foundation, Inc.

The Veatch Program

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is only one publication of a project that covered three years and involved numerous phases and aspects. The work described in this study is, therefore, the result of the efforts of many people, and reflects their insights, intelligence, dedication, and hard work.

The project was a true collaboration of the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University and the Public Agenda Foundation. Mark Garrison, the Center's Director, and Jan Kalicki, the Executive Director, were instrumental in conceptualizing and executing every aspect of the project, in reviewing all project materials, and coordinating the project's work with experts in the U.S. and overseas, and with the project's Executive Committee and National Council. Mark and Jan brought to the project a rare ability to bridge the gap between the experts and the American people, and we learned much from them. We would also like to thank their associates at the Brown Center who gave their clear thinking and hard work to the project.

Richard Smoke deserves special mention. As the Brown Center's Research Director, Richard worked (literally) thousands of hours on every phase of the effort. His expertise, his clarity, his patience, and his sincere interest in the public touched every aspect of this project. His colleagues and associates are also grateful for his wisdom, wit, and grace under pressure.

As Campaign Director for Public Summit '88, Kate Sheaffer turned an idea into reality. Kate, along with Kim Edmonds, the Campaign Media Director, demonstrated tireless effort, initiative, and enterprise in working with local staff, city officials and project cosponsors in Baltimore, Nashville, San Antonio and Seattle to conduct a citizen education effort without precedent in scope and achievement. More than 76,000 citizens took part in Public Summit '88. We offer our admiration and congratulations to Kate and Kim, and our thanks to the entire Public Summit staff and media co-sponsors, for an effort that captured an astonishing level of public interest and attention. Given the complexity (and even intimidating nature) of the issue of U.S.-Soviet relations, their challenge could hardly have been greater.

Jeffrey Tuchman, the Public Agenda's Media Director, co-authored the film describing the four futures and, Julie Lewis and the rest of his crew at the Public Agenda, produced television spots for the Public Summit '88 campaigns that were remarkable for their ability to engage people and help citizens understand this issue with clarity and force.

Project Director Tony Wagner's overall guidance, enthusiasm, commitment (and tireless travel) on behalf of the effort were invaluable. His eloquence and ability to explain every aspect of the project laid the groundwork for its success. The support he generated for the effort among foundations and sponsors across the country enabled the project to exceed its goals.

John Immerwahr, a Senior Fellow at the Public Agenda and a professor at Villanova University, also deserves our special thanks. While John conducted and analyzed much of the research leading up to the final study, and was responsible (along with the Villanova University Human Organization Science Institute) for recruiting and training the moderators who worked in the panels, his greatest contribution was bringing his insight, critical intelligence, and uncommonly good common sense to every serious problem and impass the project faced.

Robert J. Kingston, Senior Advisor to the Charles F. Kettering Foundation and the Public Agenda's "Professor Emeritus" was also an invaluable contributor to the entire effort from its inception. His efforts were especially significant in shaping the project in its earliest stages, including the the conceptualization and development of the four futures and, prior to that, the community leadership workshops and two-years worth of public opinion research leading up to this final study.

On a personal note, the authors would like to thank Deborah Wadsworth, the Public Agenda's Executive Director, for her leadership, direction and moral support (not to mention crisis management).

We would also like to acknowledge and compliment the work of our research assistants, Judith Kallick and Stephen Immerwahr, for the long hours and thoughtful work they put into this report and its companion volumes, and Sarah Hamilton for the special care she put into the layout and production of this report. And we thank them for maintaining their sense of humor throughout.

Finally, on behalf of the entire project staff, we would like to thank the distinguished Americans who served on the project's National Council and Executive Committee: Douglas Dillon, William J. Hyland, Amos A. Jordan, Walter E. Massey, David Mathews, Charles McC. Mathias, General Edward C. Meyer, Alice M. Rivlin, Thomas J. Watson, Jr.

Special thanks goes to three members of the Executive Committee: to Howard Swearer, President of Brown University for his commitment to citizen (as well as student) education, and his insight in matching the special capabilities of the Brown Center to those of the Public Agenda; to Cyrus Vance, the Public Agenda's Chairman, for believing in this project and giving so much time and effort to bring it to the attention of the nation's leaders; and to Daniel Yankelovich, the Public Agenda's President, for the vision that inspired this endeavor and his boundless faith in the American people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Summary of Findings

Chapter One: The Public's Starting Point

Chapter Two: The Public Weighs Four Futures

1. The need for a new methodology
2. Rating the four futures
3. Cooperative problem solving
4. Eliminate the nuclear risk; compete otherwise
5. The U.S. gains the upper hand
6. Defend only North America

Chapter Three: The Public's Judgment

1. Shifts in the public's thinking
2. The public's composite future
3. Summary

Appendix I

PREFACE

Following General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to the United States, and accompanying the Senate debate on the INF Treaty and the heightened debate on U.S.-Soviet relations that emerges in any Presidential election year, a series of indepth and highly informative studies of American public opinion have been conducted. Surveys from the nation's leading opinion researchers have asked Americans whether they believe Mr. Gorbachev is different from other Soviet leaders, whether they think "glasnost" is real, whether they support the INF Treaty, the building of SDI, aid to the anti-communist Nicaraguan Contras, and so on. These studies provide a valuable profile of what Americans are thinking about the Soviets in this pivotal year.

The study whose results are described here had a different aim -- to discover what kind of relationship Americans want the country to have with Soviets over the next two decades, to the year 2010. It is unique in several respects. Instead of focusing on opinions on current issues, it looks at the public's underlying values -- the rationales and beliefs that the public employs in forming opinions. Secondly, the study used new techniques that encouraged the public to weigh the pros and cons of various alternatives -- to confront the costs and benefits associated with different paths that U.S. policy might take. Thirdly, it focused on long-term directions, inviting the public to debate and decide where policy should head over a span of two decades.

Conducted by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, the study asked 963 average Americans to think about four alternative futures for U.S.-Soviet relations. And it asked them, in choosing among the alternatives, to weigh the costs, the risks, and the trade-offs associated with each. Developed after consultation with more than one hundred leading experts and decision-makers with vast experience and diverse perspectives on U.S.-Soviet relations, the study asked citizens to grapple with these questions: Should the U.S. work toward a future in which it gains the upper hand over the Soviets both militarily and politically? Or should the two countries agree to reduce their nuclear arsenals, but continue to compete in other areas? Or should the U.S. and the Soviets change their adversarial relationship and work together on common problems such as nuclear proliferation or terrorism or environmental concerns? Or, as a fourth alternative, should the U.S. move away from its role as a global superpower, and concentrate its efforts on defending only North America?

Emerging from the research is a rich and detailed picture of what Americans want for the future, what risks and trade-offs are or are not acceptable to them, and what policies they are prepared to support after they have thought seriously about the costs and compromises of each. Thus, the research captures more than just Americans' hopes and dreams -- or even their worst fears -- as important as those may be. It provides an understanding of the kind of future Americans are willing to work for and the long-term policies they will support even when confronted with the risks and costs and compromises that are part of the real world of foreign policy.

The research described in the following pages is the capstone of an ambitious project entitled "The Public, the Soviets, and Nuclear Arms." Its work has included more than 20 workshops with national security experts in the U.S. and overseas, dicussions with community leaders in ten cities across the country, and over forty focus group discussions with typical citizens to develop lines of inquiry, test hypotheses, and pretest the research design.

In January 1988, the project began a second phase of research, in itself an innovation that sought to go beyond the limitations imposed in telephone surveys. The study convened cross sections of the public in five cities across the country for intensive three-hour sessions in which the futures were presented and discussed in detail. The salient features of each future and the costs, risks, and trade-offs associated with it were explained and reiterated through video and print materials prepared specifically for this project, and in small group discussions led by professional moderators. Thus, the views expressed by participants at the end of the evening sessions -- the views described in this report -- represent something considerably more than top-of-the-head responses to this exceedingly complex arena of foreign policy.

Moreover, through a cooperative arrangement with Americans Talk Security (ATS), the project has been able to enrich its own findings by supplementing them with the most comprehensive and timely analyses of public opinion on current U.S.-Soviet relations yet available. ATS, a collaboration of three of the nation's most respected polling organizations (Marttila and Kiley, Market Opinion Research, and the Daniel Yankelovich Group) and the Public Agenda, is monitoring attitudes on U.S.-Soviet relations throughout the 1988 primaries and the general election. The ATS findings provide a context for understanding where Americans want to go in the future and what the basis is for their thinking, a context that is discussed in some detail in Chapter I.

The project has also had the benefit of what constitutes a virtual test market study of Americans' views on the four futures. Running concurrently with the formal research study was "Public Summit '88," a public education effort featuring intensive media discussion of the alternative futures (and the risks and tradeoffs associated with each) in four cities -- Baltimore, Nashville, San Antonio, and Seattle. Each campaign, cosponsored by local television stations and newspapers, culminated in city-wide balloting on the futures with over 76,000 citizens returning ballots. Yielding results generally consistent with the research findings, the Public Summit campaigns were a real-life mirror of the research. Moreover, in a compressed, but true-to-life fashion, Public Summit '88 suggests what might evolve from broad public discussion of the future of U.S.-Soviet relations over a period of years.

Taken together, the findings from the research study and the trends emerging from current polling, both described here, and the real-life debate and balloting in the Public Summit cities give leaders a thought-provoking forecast of the kinds of policies Americans are willing to support now and into the next century.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Highlights from the Research

The research study described in this report asked respondents to think through four alternative futures for U.S.-Soviet relations in the year 2010. Their responses reveal a detailed picture of what Americans want for the future and what steps they are willing to take to get there: Below are some highlights from the study.

76% of respondents ranked a future of cooperative problem solving where the two countries would work jointly on problems such as terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and pollution as their first or second choice among the four futures. 83% said that the most convincing argument in favor of this choice was that issues like these are "the real prolems facing us and the Soviets."

74% ranked a future in which the two countries would cooperate to reduce their nuclear arsenals, but compete in other areas as their first or second choice. Here, the most convincing argument was the danger of the weapons themselves. For example, 75% said we should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow nuclear weapons are ever used, "the whole world won't be destroyed."

39% ranked a future in which the U.S. tries to gain the upper hand over the Soviets as their first or second choice. Here, most respondents were concerned that trying to gain military superiority is "a formula for an endless arms race" (75%), and that this approach would be too expensive because it would mean "enormous defense spending, year after year" (70%).

The choice, however, was not without some appeal. People want the U.S. to be strong militarily as evidenced by the 71% who said the Soviets are "constantly testing us, probing for weakness and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any."

Only 12% ranked a future in which the U.S. would defend only North America and move away from its position as a global superpower as their first or second choice. In rejecting this future, people were persuaded by arguments that if the U.S. pulls back, "many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons" (66%) and that "history shows it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless, aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world" (61%).

> Here again, although respondents rejected this future, at least one aspect of it was enormously popular. 79% agreed that while the U.S. spends billions to defend Japan and Europe, "they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs." And 78% want our allies to pay more of the cost of their own defense "even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues."

Although asked to respond to four specific futures as part of the research design, people were free to pick and choose among the elements of the futures. Thus the study suggests that the public has its own preferred or composite future with the Soviets, one that combines aspects of all four presented in the study. Based on results from this study, and from other opinion research that has been made available to us, we describe the public's preferred future in the interpretive summary that follows.

Interpretive Summary

By the year 2010, Americans want a relationship with the Soviet Union that is strikingly different from the one the two countries have had in the past, a relationship that is less adversarial, more pragmatic, and more businesslike. But whether such a future is really possible depends, for most Americans, on what the Soviets themselves do in the next few years. If the Soviets, under General Secretary Gorbachev, continue to take what most Americans see as positive steps, then such a future could become a reality. If the Soviets go back to their "old ways," then something like the Cold War may resume.

Asked to think seriously about four alternative futures with the Soviets, respondents proved to have a point of view uniquely their own. They chose a future where the two countries would work jointly on common problems based on the self-interest of each. Americans believe that it is possible and sensible, despite basic differences in the two societies, for the U.S. and the Soviets to agree to reduce their nuclear arsenals sharply and jointly confront problems that endanger both countries -- problems such as nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and environmental and health crises like AIDS. Moreover, people believe that the two superpowers could and should, cooperate to "cool down" Third World crises, such as in the Middle East, that might erupt into major conflagrations drawing in both nations. In short, Americans are ready to make a deal with the Soviets for the year 2000 and beyond, _if_ the Soviet prove, in the meantime, that they will keep their part of the bargain.

Moreover, research techniques that probe beneath the surface of people's responses suggest that this willingness to turn the page on the past and begin anew with the Soviets is neither wishful thinking, nor top-of-the-head reaction, nor the afterglow of the 1987 Reagan-Gorbachev summit. Even after being forcefully and systematically confronted with the serious risks and compromises the country might be forced to live with, a large majority of respondents favored exploring a fundmentally different relationship with the Soviets over the next two decades.

The study suggests that people's desire for a different future relationship with the Soviets reflects their own thoughtful reassessment of what the dangers to the U.S. and its people really are in the 1980s and 1990s. These are the major elements of that reassessment:

> Americans no longer see the Soviets as a direct nuclear threat to the U.S., and increasingly, they see the nuclear arms race as both unwinnable and prohibitatively expensive. Therefore, a majority rejects a future in which the U.S. tries to gain the upper hand over the Soviets militarily and politically.

Americans do see serious dangers to this country from instability, violence, and terrorism in the Third World, and they believe the United States must continue to play a role as a world power. Therefore, they wholly reject a future of "isolationist" retrenchment, with the U.S. relinquishing its role as a global superpower and defending only itself and its neighbors in North America.

Americans believe that the Soviets, although not our friends, are rational and hard headed and, if we are careful, that it is possible to develop a working relationship based on the self-interest of both nations. Greatly reducing the number of nuclear arms is clearly seen to be in both countries' self-interest. The arms race is not.

Americans believe that continued hostility and mistrust toward the Soviets is diverting the country's attention from other serious threats to its future -- a lagging economy and loss of competitiveness, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, a restive and hostile Third World and other global problems. Therefore, they want to work toward a future in which the two countries turn their attention to these other problems.

It is essential to emphasize that, despite Americans' desire for a different kind of future with the Soviets, they are not prepared to leap headlong into a new relationship. People are not interested in "instant detente." Instead, they want a cautious, careful, step-by-step approach where Soviet trustworthiness is repeatedly assessed based on accrued experience. People hope that General Secretary Gorbachev is different and that the Soviets are changing, but they are skeptical about Soviet intentions, particularly in the Third World. They believe the Soviets will continue to test, probe, and take advantage of weakness. There is still deep and widespread suspicion of the Soviets, the residue of four decades of cold war.

However, what matters to most Americans is the here and now. A more cooperative future is not, for most Americans, derailed by reminders of past communist aggression or misbehavior or the ideological differences between the two countries. What can derail such a future, however, is what the Soviets do now and in the next few years. Military aggression in the Third World, reneging or cheating on arms agreements, serious new abuses in human rights could lead a large majority of Americans to conclude that a future of cooperation with the Soviets, however desirable it may be, is just not possible. If this happens, Americans stand ready to counter and renew the Cold War. The INF Treaty, the scheduled withdrawal from Afghanistan, glasnost, perestroika are, for the American people, arenas where the Soviets are essentially "on probation." The real future between the two countries depends on whether the Soviets will practice what they are now preaching.

***

CHAPTER I: THE PUBLIC'S STARTING POINT

To set a context for understanding what Americans want U.S.-Soviet relations to be like in the year 2010, we begin by looking at the present. We review findings from two sources that, together, suggest what Americans are thinking in this election year, and how that thinking has changed over the past several years. One source of data is Voter Options on Nuclear Arms which reports on a 1984 survey conducted by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University. The survey looked at public attitudes about the Soviets, nuclear arms policies, and related issues.

Our second source is a series of indepth studies of public opinion about foreign policy and national security issues conducted by the Americans Talk Security project (ATS) in late 1987 and 1988. ATS is a joint project of three nationally prominent opinion research organizations: Market Opinion Research, Marttila and Kiley, and The Daniel Yankelovich Group, with qualitative research conducted by Public Agenda. ATS is designed to provide the country's leadership, including the Presidential campaigns of both parties, with unbiased information about the current state of public thinking on U.S.-Soviet relations, the nuclear arms race, and other national security issues.

In the next few pages, we provide a profile of the current state of public opinion, a picture of what we call the public's "starting point." We also use data from Voter Options and Americans Talk Security (ATS) throughout our report to enrich findings and interpretations from our own study.

Over the past few years, Americans have taken a new look at what they see as the nature of the threat posed by the Soviet Union to this nation's security. In the 1984, Public Agenda/Brown Center Voter Options study, a 56% to 36% margin agreed that "the Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to take over the world." But three years later, in October, 1987 an ATS study by Marttila and Kiley found that this claim was rejected by a margin of 58% to 38%. In January, 1988, ATS (Market Opinion Research) also found that 61% of Americans feel that relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union are getting better, a sharp increase from the 24% expressing this view just two years before in an October 1986 Gallup study.

Similarly, in 1985, 52% of Americans said that the military threat from the Soviet Union is "constantly growing and presents a real, immediate danger to the United States." But by October, 1987, ATS found the number expressing this view had dropped to 31%.

TABLE 1: CHANGING VIEWS ABOUT THE SOVIETS

	1984-86 Agree %	1987-88 Agree %	Net Change %
The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world (*Voter Options*, 1984; ATS/M&K, 1987)	56	38	-18
The military threat from the Soviet Union is constantly growing and presents a real, immediate danger to the United States (CBS/NYT, 1985; ATS/M&K, 1987)	52	31	-21
Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are getting better (Gallup, 1986; ATS/MOR, 1988)	24	61	+37

Americans' views about the nature of the Soviet threat seemed to be shaped by several factors: first, by perceptions about General Secretary Gorbachev; second, an abiding mistrust of Soviet intentions, and third, by a characterization of Soviet intentions as hard-headed and potentially dangerous, but not irrational or maniacal.

Americans hope that Mr. Gorbachev is fundamentally different from his predecessors, but they are not certain. ATS also found that 71% think that Mr. Gorbachev is different from previous Soviet leaders, with 58% saying he "is more interested in peace" than past Soviet leaders. While 20% said that Mr. Gorbachev was "more dangerous" than past Soviet leaders, 35% said that he was "less dangerous." By January, 1988, an ATS survey by Market Opinion Research found that 72% of the public had an overall rating of Mr. Gorbachev that was generally favorable. Finally, 70% agreed that the "Soviets are more serious about arms control and more willing to make compromises in order to achieve it, than they have been in a long time."

TABLE 2: ATTITUDES TOWARDS GORBACHEV

	Agree %	Disagree %
General impressions of Gorbachev are mostly favorable	72	23
Gorbachev is different from previous Soviet leaders	71	24
The Soviets are more serious about arms control, and more willing to make compromises in order to achieve it, than they have been in a long time	70	25

ATS, Marttila and Kiley, October, 1987.

	Agree %	Disagree %
Compared to past Soviet leaders, Mikhail Gorbachev is more interested in peace with the West*	58	3
Compared to past Soviet leaders, Gorbachev is less dangerous**	35	20

ATS, Market Opinion Research, January, 1988.

---

* "Compared to past Soviet leaders, would you say that Mikhail Gorbachev is more or less interested in peace with the West, or about the same?"

**Compared to past Soviet leaders, do you think that Gorbachev is more dangerous, less dangerous, or about the same?"

Balancing the perception that Mr. Gorbachev may be different is a conviction that the Soviets still constitute a significant threat and will take advantage of any perceived weakness. In the 1984 Voter Options study, 65% of those surveyed agreed that "if we are weak, the Soviet Union, at the right moment, will attack us or our allies in Europe and Japan, and in January, 1988, 64% continued to agree with this statement (ATS, Market Opinion Research).

Moreover, people continue to feel that the Soviets are especially dangerous in the Third World. In the 1984 Voter Options report, Americans agreed, by 56% to 38%, that "whenever there is trouble in the world -- in the Middle East, Central America or anywhere else -- chances are the Soviets are behind it." And in October, 1987, ATS found that people still hold this view by a nearly identical margin (58% to 37%).

TABLE 3: ABIDING MISTRUST OF THE SOVIET UNION

	1984 Agree %	1988 Agree %
If we are weak, the Soviet Union, at the right moment, will attack us or our allies in Europe and Japan	65	64*

	1984 Agree %	1987 Agree %
Whenever there is trouble around the world -- in the Middle East, Central America or anywhere else -- the chances are the Soviets are behind it	56	58**

Voter Options, The Public Agenda Foundation and The Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, 1984.

* ATS, Market Opinion Research, January 1988.
** ATS, Marttila and Kiley, October, 1987.

Thus, what may be crucial to understanding what Americans want for the future is the sharp distinction people draw between the direct Soviet threat and that posed by terrorists or Islamic fundamentalism. Most Americans do not believe that the Soviets are likely to attack the U.S. or its allies directly or impulsively, that a Soviet invasion of Europe is imminent, or that the Soviets will launch a nuclear first strike against the U.S. through a "window of vulnerability."

In the pretest questionnaire administered to respondents for the Public Agenda/Brown Center panels, only 15% said that a nuclear war is most likely to start through a Soviet invasion of Europe or first strike against the U.S. Additionally, 67% agreed that "while the leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics." In January, 1988, ATS found that a plurality (49% to 44%) felt that "the Soviets aren't fanatics about spreading communism, they won't take any reckless chances." (These and other data that support this interpretation are discussed at length in the report.)

TABLE 4: THE SOVIET THREAT: CONSTANT, BUT NOT IRRATIONAL

	Agree %	Disagree %
While leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics	67	15*
The Soviets aren't fanatics about spreading communism, they won't take any reckless chances (ATS/MOR, January, 1988)	49	44

VIEWS ABOUT HOW A NUCLEAR WAR IS MOST LIKELY TO START

Most Likely Scenario	Agree* %
A war in the Third World (for example, in the Middle East) will escalate and draw in the superpowers	55
Terrorists or a mad man will use a nuclear weapon	21
The Soviets will invade Europe or launch a surprise attack with nuclear weapons against the U.S.	15
A nuclear weapon will be launched by accident	12

* Pretest result.

Finally, ATS found 69% saying that the recent major buildup of military defenses was necessary, with only 27% saying it was unnecessary. Therefore, people's views about the Soviets may also stem from a belief that the U.S. and its allies are militarily stronger and thus more able to deter any aggression.

Overall, a comparison of the Public Agenda/Brown Center 1984 study to current ATS data suggests that Americans' views about the Soviet threat have changed in important respects. The Soviets are seen more positively, and they are not believed to be reckless or likely to attack directly. There are widespread favorable perceptions about Mr. Gorbachev. And, though the Soviets are still seen as a threat in the Third World and likely to "take advantage of weakness," there is a general feeling that relations are improving. In short, the public's thinking about the Soviets and about U.S.-Soviet relations is in the process of a change.

TABLE 5: ATTITUDES TOWARDS RECENT MILITARY BUILD-UP

	Necessary %	Unnecessary %
The federal government has undertaken a major build-up of our military defense during the past several years, was this necessary or unnecessary	69	27

ATS/Marttila and Kiley, Inc., October 1987.

CHAPTER TWO: THE PUBLIC LOOKS AT FOUR FUTURES

The Need for a New Methodology

In the 1984 Voter Options study, the Public Agenda/Brown Center learned that public thinking about U.S.-Soviet relations and the nuclear arms race is characterized by broad areas of consensus and conflict. Areas of consensus were defined to exist when at least 75% of the public agreed with a proposition. Such areas included what an all-out nuclear war would mean, recognition that both the U.S. and the Soviet Union have an overkill capability, and the view that the nuclear arms race is unwinnable. On these questions, neither wording changes, nor context, nor question order had any significant effect on the results. Conflict was defined to exist on questions where public opinion was divided or where results changed with relatively minor changes in wording or context.

Following the 1984 report, the Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development focused their attention on exploring these areas of conflict in focus groups with citizens and workshops with community leaders in ten cities around the country. From that work, we found that one distinction was the basis of much of the conflict -- the distinction between what people saw as near-term vs. long-term dangers to the country.

People thought about the nuclear arms issue in a compartmentalized fashion; they favored short-term measures that would lead the country in a direction opposite to where they wanted to go in the long term. To illustrate, many favored a short term build up of military strength and

---

simultaneously worried about the long-term effects of such a build up. And so the primary unanswered question left from 1984 was: How would people resolve the inconsistency? What judgment would people reach about the best course for the country to follow if they took both long and short term considerations into account simultaneously?

While opinion polling using a national probability sample is the most accurate method for measuring public opinion, it reflects people's current thinking. It is best used, therefore, on issues with which people are familiar. But polling on issues that people have not considered tends to lead to volatile and unreliable results; opinions shift, depending on events, new information or arguments. In addition, even the most sophisticated questionnaire can introduce only a limited amount of information about tradeoffs, risks and costs for a given policy. Also, opinion polling gauges the views of the isolated individual: it does not reflect the impact of interactive discussion of the issue with other people.

To enable people to confront the issues of U.S.-Soviet relations and nuclear arms in a serious, thoughtful fashion, we needed a method that would enable them to think about both long-term goals for the nation and the short-term policies necessary to reach those goals. To stimulate people to reach a considered judgment about the best course for the

---

country, we needed to provide the time for them to understand a proposed policy, see its implications, (including its costs and risks), consider the arguments for and against it within a context that compared alternatives, and allow for political dialogue with others. Our tasks then were to prepare a context within which people could consider the questions, and to develop a methodology that would enable us to record and measure their responses. For the context, we constructed four visions of the future: four scenarios about how the world might be in the year 2010. The four futures had to satisfy a number of criteria simultaneously:

1. They had to include a substantial range of realistic alternatives (and, for that reason, exclude utopian options);
2. The alternatives had to be mutually exclusive, or at least not overlap to any great extent;
3. The futures had to involve choices about which direction the country should follow;
4. They had to include the important short-term policy choices;
5. A broad range of experts had to agree about the risks, costs and tradeoffs involved with each future;
6. The choices had to be understandable to the general public;
7. The futures had to be deemed ideologically balanced and fair by experts and outsiders with widely different views.

The futures were developed through a research and development process spanning more than eighteen months. In a key respect, the process was highly unusual and possibly unique. It involved two concurrent streams of research interacting with each other. Policy research, led by the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown, examined the various ways in which broad alternatives for the future of U.S.-Soviet relations could be conceived and constructed. Opinion research, led by Public Agenda, explored people's initial thoughts and preconceptions, what people "hear" and what they "don't hear," and what arguments strike them as particularly convincing or unconvincing. Mutual feedback between both streams of research were required to craft the kinds of alternative futures required for the overall project.

Once initially conceived, the futures were reviewed for political balance and accuracy by scores of experts from various institutions and with differing political points of view. They were tested for understandability and balance with the public in dozens of focus groups. After months of gestation, review by experts, analysis and research, four alternative visions of U.S.-Soviet relations in the year 2010, were formulated. The futures (described more fully in the following pages and summarized in the Appendix) are fully discussed in a pamphlet entitled Four Futures available from the Center for Foreign Policy Development. The entire research process used in this project will be described in a forthcoming book.

Once the four futures were decided on~~,~~ a method was needed which would permit people to consider them thoughtfully, and register the results. Participants would need to be given a good deal of information and have enough time to consider arguments, costs, risks and tradeoffs about complex, unfamiliar issues. A research method developed by the Public Agenda for an unrelated project met all requirements. In mid-1987, the Ford Foundation assigned the Public Agenda the task of gauging public reaction to a series of sweeping reforms of the social welfare system. The Public Agenda developed and tested a research method using "citizen review panels". (See The Public's Perspective on Social Welfare Reform, The Public Agenda Foundation, January, 1988.)

On this project, the panel method worked as follows. In January, 1988, we brought together a total of 963 people in five cities (Baltimore, Nashville, San Antonio, Seattle, and Chicago) who represented a broad cross section of the population. Panels were assembled using quotas based on race, sex, education, income and political affiliation. Findings from the panels were validated by comparing results on identical questions from national surveys using probability samples. Those checks demonstrated that the five-city sample closely approximates a national cross-section on the basis of both demographic and attitudinal similarity (Details of the method are described in the Technical Appendix, a companion volume to this report).

In each of the five-city panels, respondents filled out a pretest questionnaire to measure their opinions before the session began. We then showed a film (written and produced by staff at the Public Agenda and the Center) describing the futures. After the film, the group was divided into fifteen-person panels where a professionally trained moderator* led the group through a discussion of each future. In the panels, people were given a list of arguments for and against each future, and advised of a number of practical policies (or policy implications) that would have to be implemented if a future were to become the nation's goal. Finally, they were advised that each future made certain assumptions about the greatest danger facing the U.S. and that these needed to be understood and debated. The moderators emphasized that the project was an exercise in democracy, that they were not advocates of any position, and that people were to consider the alternatives based solely on what they thought would be the best course for the country. At the end of the session, people filled out a second, posttest questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which their views had changed, and had "worked through" their feelings to reach a stable, considered judgment.

* The Human Organization Science Institute at Villanova University was used to recruit and train the moderators who were members of the faculty at Villanova University and St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia.

SUMMARY OF THE FOUR FUTURES

SUMMARY OF THE FOUR FUTURES*

FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains The Upper Hand. By 2010, the U.S. will have achieved military and political superiority over the Soviet Union. We will have realized that the Soviets, no matter what they pretend, aim to dominate the world. So we will have developed advanced nuclear and other weapons, probably including a "Star Wars" defense against missiles. And we will be vigorously opposing Marxism in the Third World.

Arguments FOR this future:

- Possible because we are wealthier and have an edge in high technology.
- We are already in a winner-take-all competition and, realistically, this is the only way to keep the Soviets at bay.
- Grenada proves that we can stop communist expansion.
- We have an obligation to oppose Soviet/communist expansion and defend freedom.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

- Too expensive, would mean enormous defense spending, year after year.
- Too dangerous, the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat.
- A formula for an endless arms race.
- Trying to stop communism will lead to more Vietnams.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

- The greatest danger we face is Soviet aggression.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS for the next few years:

- Build up nuclear and nonnuclear weapons to a level superior to the Soviets.
- Rapidly develop and begin to deploy SDI ("Star Wars").
- Strongly aid freedom fighters combatting communism in the Third World. (Examples: Nicaragua, Africa, Afghanistan, Grenada.)

---

* For a more detailed statement of the futures, see the project's pamphlet, Four Futures available from the Center for Foreign Policy Development.

FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise. By 2010, we and the Soviets will have taken far-reaching steps to make sure that a global holocaust is impossible. Nearly all nuclear weapons will be scrapped, with strict safeguards against Soviet cheating. And the two sides will have taken steps to prevent any crisis (for instance, in the Middle East) from escalating into a global war. But despite the agreement on nuclear arms, both sides continue to compete for world influence, and both seek to gain supporters in the Third World.

Arguments FOR this future:

- If nuclear weapons are ever used, at least the world won't be destroyed.
- The Soviets now allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat.
- Local conflicts that escalate are how a nuclear war could start.
- We'll be able to strongly oppose communist expansion with less risk.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

- The fear of nuclear weapons has kept the peace since World War II.
- It's not realistic to think we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while cooperating with them on nuclear arms.
- The Soviets will cheat on arms control treaties.
- The Soviets will have more nonnuclear or conventional forces (tanks and soldiers).

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

- The greatest danger we face is global nuclear war.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS for the next few years:

- Negotiate drastic cuts in nuclear weapons, working in stages toward removing them almost entirely. Agreements must include strict verification.
- Negotiate agreements to prevent escalation of regional crises into global war.
- Support anti-communist freedom fighters in the Third World ONLY when there is no risk of a crisis with the Soviets. (Examples: Afghanistan, Grenada.)

FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. By 2010, the U.S. and the Soviet Union will have changed their whole relationship, much as the U.S. and China did in the 1970s. The two sides are now cooperating on problems that face them both, such as terrorism, the spread of nuclear weapons, and dangers to the environment. The two sides have built up trust, which allows them to work now on the tougher problem of nuclear weapons. Building up trust has not been done on U.S. terms; both sides have made compromises.

Arguments FOR this future:

- The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets.
- Improving trust is the only way to end the arms race.
- They seem willing to go down this path.
- Unless we change the relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

- Would require sharing high technology and giving up our main edge.
- The Soviets will pretend to cooperate, then turn on us.
- Would mean ending the fight against communist expansion and accepting a dictatorship as our partner.
- Would mean sharing or not building SDI, and never gaining clear military superiority.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

- The greatest danger we face is the hostility between the two sides.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS for the next few years:

- Begin working with the Soviets on common problems: AIDS, terrorism, the spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and other environmental dangers.
- As greater trust is built up, use that trust to attack the tougher problem of nuclear weapons.
- Treat communist Third World nations pragmatically, not ideologically. (Example, open trade with Cuba.)

FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America. By 2010, we will have recognized that the main challenge we face in not the Soviets but problems here at home. We will have phased out our alliances in Europe and Asia, and brought home our troops. Now the U.S. maintains a strong defense of North America, probably including a ("Star Wars") defense against missiles. Otherwise we are concentrating on our own affairs. What the Soviets do or don't do is not a major concern.

Arguments FOR this future:

- Our allies are capable of defending themselves.
- We spend billions to defend Japan and Europe while they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs.
- We can't afford to defend so many nations.
- Being the "world's policeman" increases the chances of nuclear war.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

- Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and leave us alone in a world filled with enemies.
- Other nations will feel the need to build their own nuclear weapons.
- We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

- The greatest danger we face is being involved in other people's affairs all around the world.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS for the next few years:

- Tell the West Europeans, Japanese and other allies that we will phase out alliances on a set schedule.
- Begin to bring our troops home from abroad. All of them will be home in, say, ten years.
- Rapidly develop and begin to deploy SDI ("Star Wars") if it proves effective.

Overall Reaction to the Four Futures

People's posttest (considered) responses show they want a future relationship with the Soviet Union that is fundamentally different from the one we have today. Asked to rank the futures in order of preference, 46% chose the future in which the U.S. and the Soviets have a cooperative relationship and work together to solve common problems (Future Three) as their first choice, and 30% named it second. In sum, 76% said this was either their first or second choice. In addition to rank-ordering the futures, we asked people to rate each future in terms of overall favorability, and 70% said they "strongly" or "somewhat" favored this future, and 21% were opposed.

The future in which the U.S. and the Soviets have eliminated the risk of nuclear annihilation while continuing to compete in the Third World (Future Two) was the second most popular alternative, with 28% naming it as their first choice, and 46% naming it second. In total, 74% said this future was their first or second preference. In terms of overall favorability, 55% said they strongly or somewhat favored this future, with 34% opposed.

TABLE 6: POSTTEST RANKING OF THE FUTURES

Futures Three and Two were the most popular, and Future Four was rejected.

	Posttest Rank Order		
Future	First Choice %	Second Choice %	First or Second Choice %
FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand	24	15	39
FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Otherwise Compete	28	46	74
FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving	46	30	76
FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America	4	8	12

Most people did not favor the idea of trying to gain military superiority over the Soviets. The U.S. gaining the upper hand militarily and politically over the Soviet Union (Future One) was the first choice of 24%, and the second choice of 15%. That is, 39% said this future was either their first or second choice. However, as we shall discuss later, certain elements of this future had broad appeal. Asked to rate this approach in terms of overall favorability, 49% said they either strongly or somewhat favored the U.S. gaining the upper hand, and 41% were opposed.

The public almost totally rejected the idea that the U.S. should withdraw its military forces from around the globe and defend only the continent of North America. Future Four was the first choice of only 4%, and another 8% named is as their second preference. When asked about this approach by itself, 29% favored it and 65% were opposed. However, as we shall discuss, certain elements of this approach also struck a responsive chord among large number of people. (See Tables 6 and 7.)

TABLE 7: SUMMARY: VIEWS ABOUT THE FOUR FUTURES

Future	Total in Favor	Total Opposed
	%	%
Future One	49	41
Future Two	55	34
Future Three	70	21
Future Four	29	65

Future	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Strongly Oppose	Somewhat Oppose
	%	%	%	%
Future One	26	23	17	24
Future Two	21	34	21	13
Future Three	39	31	13	8
Future Four	14	15	23	42

Perhaps as important as reactions to the futures themselves is the fact that elements or aspects of each future were rated favorably. That is, people found arguments or policies related to all four futures to be appealing, even though they may have been uncomfortable with other aspects. These results suggest that people's preference for one or another of the futures as a whole is only part of the story. What may be even more analytically significant is how people rated the elements and arguments separately.

In the next sections, we detail reactions to the four futures, explaining what people did and did not like about each one, including which arguments they found convincing. Then we combine the arguments and policies that people favored about each future into what might be considered a hypothetical fifth alternative -- in effect, what appears to be the public's preferred future. It is this preferred future that may provide clues about what a new, broadly-based national security policy consensus in the United States would look like.

***

FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

The Most Popular Future: Cooperative Problem Solving

In the world of Future Three, the superpowers' relationship has changed from one of fierce hostility and competition to a businesslike, working relationship addressing common problems such as the spread of nuclear weapons, terrorism, nuclear power plant safety, space exploration and environmental protection. This future was presented and discussed, not as "the outbreak of peace," but as a pragmatic approach toward dealing with urgent problems confronting both countries that would be easier to solve if the superpowers worked together. That is, common self-interest, not the desire for friendship, was the underlying rationale for this future. Concrete policy options and trade-offs, including costs and risks, were systematically presented with this and each of the other futures.

TABLE 8: REACTION TO FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to win trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us.

Views About Future Three		Total %	
Strongly Favor	Total in Favor	39	> 70
Somewhat Favor		31	
Somewhat Oppose	Total Opposed	13	> 21
Strongly Oppose		8	
Not Sure		9	

Cooperative Problem Solving was the most popular future. In the posttest, 70% favored this approach. As noted earlier, when asked to rank the futures, 76% selected it as their first or second choice. The pragmatic appeal of this approach is underscored by the fact that, by and large, people liked it regardless of their political party or ideological orientation. Among Republicans, for example, 66% favored this approach (compared to 74% among Democrats and 74% among Independents); and 71% of Republicans gave this future a rank of first or second (compared to 79% among Democrats and 85% among Independents). Among conservatives, 70% ranked it first or second (compared to 82% among liberals and 76% among moderates); and 65% of conservatives favored it compared to 80% among liberals and 71% among moderates.

TABLE 9: REACTION TO FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

(Key demographics)

FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem-Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to win trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us.

Views About Future Three	Favor	Oppose	Not Sure	Rank Order First or Second
	%	%	%	%
Total	70	21	9	76
Democrats	74	17	10	79
Republicans	66	28	6	71
Independents	74	19	7	85
Liberals	80	13	7	82
Moderates	71	19	10	76
Conservatives	65	30	6	70

What People Like About This Approach

1. We and the Soviets face common problems: People felt that the most convincing argument for trying to forge a working relationship with the Soviets by the year 2010 is that superpower mistrust and hostility keeps both countries from focusing their attention on urgent problems that represent even greater long-term threats to both. That is, each side's preoccupation with the other keeps both superpowers from turning their attention to issues threatening both of them. At a consensus level of 83%, people agreed that a convincing argument for this option is that issues such as "the spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets." (See Table 10.)

A man from Baltimore expressed this sentiment with these words: "Twenty years from now," he said, "who's going to care about nuclear weapons when you got millions of people in the graveyard with AIDS." A Chicago area man said, "Not long ago, terrorists [in the Middle East] seized their people [Soviet diplomats/advisors] too. The threat from Moslem radicals will push the two sides together." Another person from Chicago offered a similar thought. "I think the big threat is coming from radicals and from the others [in the Middle East]," he said. "If they get their hands on nuclear weapons, look out." And a woman from San Antonio offered what she saw as another area of mutual interest. "They have problems with nuclear

TABLE 10: REACTIONS TO THE ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FUTURE THREE

Pro Arguments:	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing
	%	%
The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets	83	14
Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreement won't make us safe	73	18
A basic change in the US-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race	73	20
The Soviets seem willing to go down this path	40	38
Con Arguments:		
The Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge	43	48
The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, then turn on us as they've done in the past	42	39
This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI, and giving up the idea of gaining military superiority	42	45
This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner	26	59

---

power," she said. "They had that big trouble [at Chernobyl] and we had Three Mile Island. There [improving nuclear power plant safety] is something we could work on together."

2. The relationship is more important than the weapons: Two additional arguments for this future were found to be persuasive by large majorities, and both arguments relate to the arms race. As many as 73% agreed that "unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreement won't make us safe." The same number also said that "a basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race." In effect, people believe that it is the tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, rather than the weapons, that determines how much danger we face. To the public, the relationship between the U.S. and the Soviet Union is the key The arms race, nuclear weapons, and the status of any arms control agreements, while important, are all considered to be on by-products of the relationship and, by themselves, much less important than the level of tensions. (See Table 10)

A woman from Nashville expressed this sentiment when she said, "You've got to have a good relationship before you can really do anything [such

---

as sharply reducing both sides' nuclear arsenals]." A Nashville man echoed this thought. "The first thing you've got to do is try to understand the other side a little better, and vice versa, before you try to do anything else [such as drastic nuclear arms reductions]." A Chicago-area man said, "I think you've really got to start building trust in areas that aren't so sensitive as nuclear weapons. I'm not sure how much can be achieved by 2010; we have to work slowly. But [U.S.-Soviet relations] could be much better [in a generation]."

The public's view in this respect is quite different from much expert opinion. For example, many experts (including the Scowcroft Commission) argue that the best way to reduce the danger of nuclear annihilation is to develop and maintain a stable nuclear deterrent. In another area, some experts, including former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, have long argued that the risks of failure at a superpower summit are so great that summit meetings should be arranged only when two leaders can ratify what has already been agreed upon in negotiations.

The public's views stand in sharp contrast to this kind of expert thinking. To the public, tension is the problem. And reducing tensions is felt to be a more effective way to reduce the danger of conflict (and of nuclear annihilation) than what is seen as a mechanistic or mechanical approach such as developing a particular missile system or negotiating a particular arms control treaty. Comments from the discussions (and from focus group interviews in preparation for the panels) suggest that the public is usually happy to see a summit meeting, regardless of whether an agreement is reached. A summit where the U.S. President and the Soviet leader meet and talk cordially is, to the public, _important in and of itself_ because it is a tangible indication of a normalized relationship in which superpower tensions (and thus the chances of U.S.-Soviet conflict) have been reduced or are at least under control. Therefore, the idea of regular or even annual summits (which experts might consider to be a waste of time or, worse, even dangerous) would be popular since the public feels that dialogue between leaders is, in and of itself, a useful way to reduce tensions and thus lessen the risk of conflict.

3. Some willingness to give up SDI: With each future, people were given a number of policy options. Asked about policies that would move the country toward Future Three, a majority said they would give up (or share) SDI in order to build a more cooperative working relationship with the Soviets. As many as 59% said they would accept this trade-off, a result suggesting that support for developing a working partnership on common problems is both deep and widely held. On the other hand, as we shall discuss later, a majority would not give up SDI to get an agreement on deep cuts in nuclear weapons. Therefore, we believe that the public's views about SDI are quite complex, and we interpret this result as indicative of the public's willingness to pay a high price for changing the U.S.-Soviet relationship, rather than as a definitive reading of their willingness to trade off SDI.

A related policy question drew virtual majority support; 50% said they would favor the U.S. and the Soviet Union working together on an ambitious space project such as a manned mission to the planet Mars, even if that meant sharing our high technology. "When I think of things the Russians could give us [if the two countries had a cooperative relationship], I think they could help us with our space program," a woman from Seattle said. "Ever since Challenger, we've had a lot of trouble [with the space program], and they [the Soviets] seem to be ahead of us in space." However, 43% opposed this policy, suggesting, as mentioned and discussed further below, rather widespread reluctance to share such technology. (See Table 11.)

TABLE 11: VIEWS ABOUT POLICIES RELATED TO FUTURE THREE

	Posttest Total				
Statement	Strg Favor	Smwt Favor	Smwt Oppse	Strg Oppse	NS
	%	%	%	%	%
We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries, even if the only way to gain their trust is by sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars	28	31	19	17	6
Total in Favor/Opposed	59		36		
We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars even if that means sharing our high technology	21	29	21	22	7
Total in Favor/Opposed	50		43		
We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations even if that means strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere	10	26	22	32	10
Total in Favor/Opposed	36		54		

The Public's Reservations About this Approach:

1. Will the Soviets only pretend to cooperate? As with each of the futures, respondents were systematically informed that developing a relationship of cooperative problem solving involved certain tradeoffs, risks and counter-arguments. One argument against this future was convincing only to a minority. When people were told that this future "would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner." only 26% said that this was a convincing argument. However, a large minority (42%) expressed concern about whether the Soviets were truly interested in working together, saying that a convincing argument against this approach was that the Soviets will only "pretend to cooperate, then turn on us." In principle, this future was acceptable to a large majority; but many question whether Soviet behavior will make this option feasible. (See Table 10.)

2. Should we share our high technology? People expressed reservations about sharing U.S. high technology. In order to build trust and forge a working partnership, people were told, the U.S. and the Soviets would have to share expertise in areas where each had an advantage. One such trade-off, it was explained, involved the U.S. sharing its high technology. People were divided about whether sharing high technology "and giving up our main edge" was a convincing argument against this approach, with 43% saying it was and 48% said it wasn't. (See Table 10.)

In the discussions, many people expressed deep reservations about this step. A Nashville man said, "They [the Soviets] will take [our high technology] home with them, and then they'll be better off than we are." A woman from that city said, "They may steal [our high technology], but it won't be the first time we've been stolen blind." A man from Chicago said, "Their economy is in such disarray that they want to get technology from us and the only way to do that is to be friendly." But others felt that taking this step was an acceptable risk as long as it was not done recklessly. "Let's do it [share high technology] gradually," a man from San Antonio said. "Let's start with things like medical [technology] and the environment [that do not have national security implications]."

3. What are Soviet intentions in the Third World? The greatest reservation people have about a future of cooperative problem solving center around questions about Soviet intentions in the Third World. In the 1984 Public Agenda/Brown Center *Voter Options* study, people said, by a margin of 56% to 38%, that "whenever there is trouble around the world -- in the Middle East, Central America or anywhere else -- chances are the Soviets are behind it." In the October, 1987, ATS/Marttila and Kiley study, 58% agreed with this view. In the panels, majorities said that in the foreseeable future, it was at least fairly likely that the Soviets would increase their support of terrorist groups and countries (69%) or attack another country in the way they invaded Afghanistan (66%). Also, 55% said that it was at least fairly likely that Marxism/communism would spread to more and more countries, and 53% agreed that no matter what they say, the Soviets will never stop trying to reach the goal of a communist world. (See Table 12.)

TABLE 12: PERCEIVED DANGERS PRESENTED BY THE SOVIET UNION

Agree with Statement	Total %
The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any	68*
It is (very or fairly) likely that the Soviet Union will increase their support of countries like Libya and of terrorist groups in the Mideast	69
It is (very or fairly) likely that the Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan	66
Whenever there's trouble in the world -- in the Middle East, Central America, or anywhere else -- the chances are the Soviets are behind it	58**
It is (very or fairly) likely that Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the globe	55
No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal	53
The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S.	17

* Pretest result.
** ATS/Marttila and Kiley, Inc., October, 1987.

In Summary: Proceed with Caution

People were asked to consider each future in terms of what to do over the next twenty years. Hardly anyone felt that the U.S. should (or could) develop a full working relationship on common problems in the short term. To the contrary, people made it clear in the discussions that they thought such a move would be risky or even reckless. People said the U.S. should take steps in this direction, but that these steps should be gradual, taken one-at-a-time, and that we should carefully assess what the Soviets do in response. Exceptionally large numbers were "not sure" if the Soviets want to work with us on common problems (27%), or "ready to do business with us just like the Chinese did in the 1970s," (46%).* The comments of a San Antonio woman reflected many people's sentiments. "We shouldn't do this overnight," she said. "Don't go jumping off the end. Build trust gradually. Slowly, very slowly. But we won't know if this [approach] works until we try it." (See Table 13.)

---

* On a few items, unusually large numbers said they were "not sure," and all of those items involved the intentions of the Soviet leadership. A "not sure" percentage of 46% is extraordinary.

TABLE 13: WIDESPREAD UNCERTAINTY ABOUT SOVIET INTENTIONS

Statement	Pretest Not Sure
	%
The new Soviet leaders are ready to "do business" with us just like the Chinese were in the 1970's	46
The Soviets will cheat on any nuclear arms agreement they sign	36
When all is said and done, someday the US will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism	33
The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world	27

While people were hopeful that a working relationship can be forged, most were only cautiously optimistic. A Seattle man said, "Everything seems to be going very smoothly between us and Russia now, but Gorbachev may not be secure in his decisions, he might change his mind. Or what happens if he's overthrown? We'd be back where we started." And a man from Chicago said, "With Gorbachev, they are opening up, giving their people more freedom. I do think we can do this [establish a working relationship on common problems] with watchfulness. We have to be watchful."

FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE

Future Two: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Otherwise Compete

The second most popular future presented a world that is very different from the one envisioned in Future Three. In Future Two, the superpowers are not cooperating on a broad range of common problems. Rather, they have recognized that they have one overriding mutual interest and can cooperate in only one area of extraordinary importance -- eliminating the threat of mutual annihilation. In this future, the two sides realize that they have irreconcilable philosophical differences, and so continue to compete and vie for influence in the world. Nevertheless, each has also come to see that its adversary sincerely wants to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, and so both sides have agreed to reduce drastically their nuclear arsenals and negotiate agreements to make sure that regional conflicts do not escalate into all-out war.

As noted, Future Two was the second most popular future of those surveyed, with 28% naming it as their first choice, and 46% saying it was their second preference. In total, 74% said that this future was their first or second choice. When asked about this future by itself, not compared to the others, 55% either strongly or somewhat favored trying to eliminate the nuclear threat while otherwise competing with the Soviets. (See Table 6.)

TABLE 14: REACTION TO FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT; COMPETE OTHERWISE

FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise. Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.

PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before there is a nuclear war.

CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements.

Views About Future Two		Total	%
Strongly Favor	Total in Favor	21	>55
Somewhat Favor		34	
Somewhat Oppose	Total Opposed	21	>34
Strongly Oppose		13	
Not Sure		11	

This future combined three main ideas: drastic reductions in nuclear arsenals; agreements with the Soviets to make sure that regional conflicts do not escalate into all-out war; but continued competition and clear rivalry for influence in the Third World. Below, we discuss reactions to each component.

What the Public Liked About This Approach

1. If the unthinkable were to happen: Future Two features reductions in the superpowers' nuclear arsenals that are drastic enough to eliminate the threat of destroying civilization in a holocaust. This idea is popular indeed. In January, 1988, ATS found that 81% approved of the START proposal in which "the U.S. and the Soviet Union are talking about cutting their long range nuclear forces in half." The reason for this sentiment and a powerful argument in favor of Future Two involves the sheer size of the two sides' nuclear arsenals and the likely effect of a nuclear war. In the 1984 *Voter Options* report, 90% agreed that "we and the Soviets now have enough nuclear weapons to blow each other up several times over." A woman from Seattle expressed this same thought. "We both have the ability to blow each other up, what -- six hundred times?" she said. "What do we need all those weapons *for*? Why do we need so many?." A man from Baltimore added, "These things [nuclear weapons] are lying around like hand grenades." (See Table 17.)

TABLE 15: REACTIONS TO THE ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FUTURE TWO

Pro Arguments:	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing
	%	%
We and the Soviets should reach agreements to prevent local conflicts, such as in the Middle East, from escalating because they are the major way that a nuclear war might start	75	17
We should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow they are ever used, the whole world won't be destroyed	75	23
Under their new leader, the Soviets will allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat	47	41
Eliminating the nuclear threat will enable us to oppose communist expansion in the Third World with less risk	42	42
Con Arguments:		
This future would leave the Soviets with a large advantage in nonnuclear (conventional) forces such as tanks and soldiers	53	33
The Soviets can't be trusted and will cheat on arms control treaties	47	37
It's just not realistic to think that we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while at the same time, cooperate with them to eliminate the risk of nuclear war	38	45
We should not reach agreements to end the arms race because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since World War II	31	57

In this vein, 75% said that a convincing argument for this future is that "we should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow they are ever used, the whole world won't be destroyed." A woman from Nashville said, "The way things are now, everything is in jeopardy. Every person on earth, maybe every living thing on earth could be killed in a nuclear war. We will destroy the planet if we keep going the way we have been." A man from Seattle said, "It's like we have a dam, but we can't keep piling stuff up behind the dam, because if the dam breaks, then it will mean the end of everything." (See Table 15.)

---

2. A Third World conflict is the most likely way that a nuclear war will start: A second reason for the popularity of Future Two stems from people's beliefs about how a nuclear war is most likely to start. People were given four scenarios about how a nuclear war might begin, and asked which one they thought was most likely. The scenarios were: a Soviet attack in Europe or elsewhere during a time of tension; the escalation of a regional conflict that drags in the superpowers; the use of a nuclear weapon by a terrorist or madman; and the accidental launch of a nuclear weapon, perhaps by a computer. A majority (52%) said that the most likely scenario was that a regional conflict would escalate and drag in the superpowers. A man from Baltimore spoke for many when he said, "The problem in the Middle East is that you've got more than the Russians and the United States involved. It's the third guy who pulls you into a confrontation. That's the most dangerous thing." (See Table 17.)

Consistent with their belief about how a nuclear war is most likely to start is the fact that, at a consensus-level, people endorsed the idea of negotiating with the Soviets to make sure that regional conflicts do not escalate; 75% said that a convincing argument for eliminating the nuclear threat (Future Two) is that "We and the Soviets should reach agreements to prevent local conflicts, such as in the Middle East, from escalating because they are the major way that a nuclear war might start." Additionally, 70% said they would favor reaching such an agreement "even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose." (See Table 15 and 16.)

TABLE 16: VIEWS ABOUT POLICIES RELATED TO FUTURE TWO

Statement	Posttest Total				
	Strg Favor	Smwt Favor	Smwt Oppse	Strg Oppse	NS
	%	%	%	%	%
We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means increasing our nonnuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches theirs	37	37	12	8	6
Total in Favor/Opposed	74		20		
We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose	28	42	13	7	11
Total in Favor/Opposed	70		20		
We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world	17	30	19	28	6
Total in Favor/Opposed	47		47		

3. The Soviets are not seen as a direct, nuclear threat: People do have concerns about Soviet intentions in the Third World. But a consensus-level, 82%, agreed that "though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do." That is, most people think that the Soviet Union does not pose a direct, nuclear threat to the U.S. Asked how a nuclear war is most likely to start, only 15% named a Soviet invasion of Europe or a surprise attack against the U.S. as the most likely scenario. A woman from Nashville said, "If there were a nuclear war, then America would be destroyed, but so would the whole world. And I think that point is realized by the Soviets." (See Tables 17 and 18.)

This result is a far cry from the views that shaped U.S. policy during the Cold War years when our greatest threat was felt to be a direct confrontation against the Soviets with Europe as the battleground. Today, most people do not think the Soviets are likely to attack the U.S. or its allies suddenly or impulsively. In fact, only 22% said the Soviets would have attacked the U.S. with atomic weapons in the 1950s if the Soviets had invented the A-bomb and had an atomic monopoly from the end of World War II until about 1955 as the U.S. did. (See Table 19.)

TABLE 17: VIEWS ABOUT HOW A NUCLEAR WAR IS MOST LIKELY TO START

The Most Likely Scenario Is:	Agree*
	%
A war in the Third World (for example, in the Middle East) will escalate and draw in the superpowers	52
Terrorists or a mad man will use a nuclear weapon	21
The Soviets will invade Europe or launch a surprise attack with nuclear weapons against the U.S.	15
A nuclear weapon will be launched by accident	12

* Pretest result.

VIEWS ABOUT START TALKS

Statement	ATS/MOR Jan 88		
	Approve	Disapprove	Not Sure
	%	%	%
he U.S. and the Soviet Union are talking about cutting their long range nuclear forces in half. Do you approve or disapprove?	81	12	7

The January, 1988 survey conducted by Market Opinion Research for ATS, showed that Americans believe the leaders of the Soviet Union are not reckless; in the panels, 67% agreed that while they may be ruthless, the leaders of the Soviet Union are not "irrational fanatics." In this regard, the public considers the Soviet leadership to be very different from Iranian or Moslem radicals. Even some who spoke with concern about the downing of Korean Airlines Flight #007 suggested that other factors besides fanaticism were involved. A San Antonio man said, "With the airliner [Flight #007], I would say that was caused by a lack of communications and the lack of [effective Soviet] technology. They didn't realize [#007 was a commercial aircraft], they just assumed [it was a spy plane]. I don't think they meant [to shoot down a plane filled with civilians]." Another man offered this view. "They're chess players," he said. "Chess is their national game. They're cautious and deliberate, they think carefully about every move. But they're not about to tip over the board." (See Table 18.)

TABLE 18: PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE NUCLEAR THREAT POSED BY THE SOVIET UNION

Agree with statement	Total
	%
Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do	82
While the leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics	67*
It is (very or fairly) likely that sooner or later, the Soviets will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S.	20
The most likely way that a nuclear war will start is due to a Soviet invasion of Europe or a nuclear surprise attack against the U.S.	15*

* Pretest result.

Together, these results suggest that people see the Soviets as a dangerous adversary -- but as a long-term, nonnuclear threat to the U.S. and its allies, not as a fanatical or a direct, nuclear threat. As noted, people think it is far more likely that the Soviets will cause trouble in the Third World by supporting terrorism and communist insurgencies. A San Antonio woman said, "The Russians don't want a nuclear war that would destroy our land -- but they probably do want our land. They may want to take over our corn fields and factories, but they don't want to make them radioactive or blow them up." A man from Nashville expressed a similar sentiment. "I'm not worried about [nuclear war with] the Soviet Union because they don't want to destroy the world, they want to dominate it."

TABLE 19: VIEWS ABOUT WHAT THE SOVIETS WOULD HAVE DONE HAD THEY INVENTED THE A-BOMB

Q. "Imagine that history were changed and the Soviet Union, not the United States, invented the atomic bomb. Imagine that the Soviet Union used A-bombs on Japan to end World War II, and that they were the only country in the world with atomic (or nuclear) weapons from about 1945 until about 1955. If history were different, which of these do you think would have happened?"

	Pretest Agree
	%
A. Sometime between 1945 and 1955, the Soviets would have attacked the U.S. with atomic bombs, thereby defeating their strongest enemy	22
B. The Soviets would have tried to intimidate the U.S. by threatening to use atomic bombs, but they would never have actually exploded any; their goal is to take over the U.S., not blow it up	50
C. The Soviets would have used atomic weapons only to defend themselves and their allies	15
Not Sure	13

---

4. Do nuclear weapons keep the peace? The Market Opinion Research study from January 1988 shows the public rejecting the argument that we should not drastically cutback on nuclear weapons because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since the end of World War II. In that study, only 27% said that the elimination of all nuclear weapons would make war with the Soviet Union more likely. A nearly equal number (22%) said this would make war less likely, and 47% said it wouldn't make a difference. (See Table 20.)

Reactions in the panels were consistent with that finding. While 31% agreed that we should not end the arms race because nuclear weapons have kept the peace, 57% found that this was a convincing argument against future two. "I disagree completely [with the idea that nuclear weapons have kept the peace]," said a woman from Seattle. "What about Vietnam? Was Vietnam peace? Do you call that peace?" (See Table 15.)

TABLE 20: VIEWS ABOUT WHETHER NUCLEAR WEAPONS PREVENT WAR

Q. Some people "point out that the United States and the Soviet Union do not dare start a war with each other because each side would be destroyed by the other side's nuclear weapons. If they eliminated all their nuclear weapons, they would be more likely to go to war. What is your opinion -- do you think eliminating all nuclear weapons would make war between the United States and the Soviet Union more likely, less likely, or wouldn't make a difference?"

	ATS/MOR Jan, 1988
	%
More likely	27
Wouldn't make a difference	47
Less likely	22
Don't know/refused	4

---

5. Direct linkage: Only a minority (36%) said that the U.S. should "refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights, even if that means not signing any arms control agreements." As many as 58% rejected the idea of directly linking human rights to arms control. "If [a proposed arms reduction agreement] is a good deal for us," a Nashville man said, "we should judge it on its own merits and sign. If it's not a good deal, don't sign." However, this man also went on to suggest that fundamental progress in terms of U.S.-Soviet relations would be made only when Soviet behavior moderated in a number of areas including human rights, a withdrawal from Afghanistan, and reduced support for communist insurgencies around the world. Importantly, this response is consistent with the view (described in the discussion on Cooperative Problem Solving, Future Three) that the relationship is more important than the weapons; and Soviet actions do more to shape people's views about the state of U.S.-Soviet relations than any other factor.

The Public's Reservations About this Approach:

1. Can the Soviets be trusted? Given that this future entails a significant reduction in weapons, the theme of whether we can trust the Soviets to abide by nuclear arms reduction agreements ran through the

TABLE 21: VIEWS ABOUT WHETHER THE SOVIETS CAN BE TRUSTED

Q. "Do you think the Soviet Union can or cannot be trusted to keep it part of the agreement in this [the INF] treaty?"

	ATS/MOR Jan, 1988 %	LA Times Nov, 1985 %
Can Be Trusted	43	24
Cannot Be Trusted	48	66
Don't Know/Refused	10	10

Q. "[INF] is a good way to find out if the Soviets can be trusted before we agree to more arms reductions."

	ATS/MOR Jan, 1988 %
Agree	86
Disagree	12

Q. "Some people say that if Gorbachev succeeds in implementing his policies, he will produce significant changed in the Soviet Union. I'm going to mention some of those possible changes; for each one, please tell me whether you feel it is very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or very unlikely that this change will result from Gorbachev's leadership?

-- The Soviet Union will become more committed to reducing nuclear arms and willing to make reasonable concessions in order to achieve this goal."

	ATS/M&K Oct, 1987 %
Very Likely	16
Somewhat Likely	48
Somewhat Unlikely	19
Very Unlikely	13
Not Sure	4

principal reservations people voiced about the idea of eliminating the nuclear risk (Future Two). An ATS study (Market Opinion Research, January 1988) found that people doubted whether the Soviets could be trusted to keep their part of an arms control bargain, with only 43% saying the Soviets "can be trusted to keep its part of an agreement in the [INF] treaty," and 48% saying they cannot be. In the panels, people agreed by a margin of 47% to 37% that a convincing argument against this future was that "the Soviets can't be trusted and will cheat on arms control treaties." A man from Nashville said, "The Russians are going to cheat, we know that ahead of time." A woman from San Antonio said, "I think their ethic is, 'The end justifies the means.' They will lie and deceive just to get what they want. A lot of people want peace so badly that they'll believe them." (See Tables 15 and 21.)

In October, 1987, ATS/Marttila and Kiley also found uncertainty about Soviet trustworthiness. While a majority (64%) said it was likely that, in the future, the Soviets will become more committed to reducing nuclear arms and willing to make reasonable concessions to achieve this goal in the future, only 16% said this was "very likely." A Seattle man said, "I want to believe [that the Soviets won't cheat]. But I question whether they will cheat or not." (See Table 21.)

TABLE 22: VIEWS ABOUT THE INF TREATY

Views About the INF Treaty	ATS/MOR Jan, 1988 %	ATS/M&K Oct, 1987 %
Approve	79	72
Disapprove	17	20

Q. Does this treaty make the world more or less safe?

	ATS/MOR Jan 1988 %
More Safe	40
Doesn't Make Much Difference	52
Less Safe	6

Q. "How likely is it that the U.S. will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position?"

	Posttest %
Very Likely	9
Fairly Likely	20
Not That Likely	65
Not Sure	7

Q. "Should we reach a 50% nuclear reduction agreement as soon as possible or delay until we know the Soviets adhere to [INF]?"

	ATS/MOR Jan 1988 %
Delay Agreement	66
Reach Agreement	30

At the same time, people have little immediate concern that the U.S. will sign an arms reduction agreement that will "leave us in a weak or inferior position." Only 29% say this was even fairly likely. In January, 1988, Market Opinion Research/ATS found that 79% either strongly or somewhat approve of the recently negotiated INF agreement. And in that survey, 66% suggested that INF was a good way to test Soviet sincerity, by agreeing that the U.S. should delay signing a START agreement "until we know if the Soviet Union lives up to" the INF accord. In sum, the results suggest that people are hopeful about the recently negotiated INF agreement, and willing to use it to test Soviet trustworthiness. People are wary but hopeful about drastic nuclear arms reductions in the future. While there is a national consensus to move in this direction, there is also widespread ambivalence about whether the Soviets can be trusted to abide by future agreements that sharply cut the size of the two superpowers' nuclear arsenals. (See Table 22.)

2. Nuclear arms reductions would leave a conventional imbalance: A second reservation people had about eliminating the nuclear threat was that drastic nuclear arms reductions would leave a conventional imbalance. Given people's views about the threat of Soviet expansionism, this approach would, to some, only "make the world safe for the Red

TABLE 23: VIEWS ABOUT THE CONVENTIONAL WEAPON IMBALANCE

Which of these three policies on conventional forces do you favor before another arms reduction?

	ATS/MOR Jan, 1988
	%
Soviet Reductions Needed	43
NATO Increases Needed	27
Go Ahead Without Either	22

VIEWS ABOUT THE ARMS RACE

Agree With Statement	Total
	%
If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets, they would keep building until they caught up	83*
It is (very or fairly) likely that we will neglect problems here in the U.S. by spending so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race	72

* Pretest result.

Army." Large numbers expressed a related concern. For example, 53% said that a convincing argument against Future Two was that "this future would leave the Soviets with a large advantage in nonnuclear or conventional forces such as tanks and soldiers." In January, 1988, ATS/Market Opinion Research found similar public disquiet about a conventional imbalance in a world with many fewer nuclear warheads. (See Table 15 and 23.)

In effect, people's responses suggest that they think that a conventional imbalance in a world with fewer nuclear weapons would leave the U.S. in a dangerous and unstable situation. A man from Nashville used the following analogy. "You've got to have equal power. It's like kids in school. The big kids are going to pick on the little kids. But when the little kids grow up [and get as strong as the bigger kids], there's no more trouble."

How does the public want to resolve this imbalance? In the panels, 74% said they would favor drastic nuclear arms reductions even if that meant increasing our conventional strength. In January, 1988, ATS found that the public's clear preference was for Soviet conventional force reductions rather than a buildup of U.S. or Western strength. But the more important point is that the public believes the imbalance should be redressed one way or the other for at least two reasons: first, they believe that the imbalance is militarily dangerous, especially given their concerns about Soviet intentions in the Third World; and second, many see this as a good litmus-test issue of Soviet intentions. "This is a way to find out just how sincere they are," a Seattle area woman said. "If they want us to cut back [on nuclear weapons], they have to show us ahead of time that they won't take advantage [with their superior conventional forces]."

3. Cooperating and competing simultaneously: People expressed uncertainty about the central premise of this approach: whether the two sides can drastically cut their nuclear arsenals and simultaneously compete for influence around the world. While experts may feel that such a strategy is realistic, a sizable minority (38%) said a convincing argument against this approach is that "it's just not realistic to think that we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while, at the same time, cooperate with them to eliminate the risk of nuclear war." And 17% were not sure. A man from Chicago put it this way: "How can you say that in one area, we're going to be hostile and in another area we're going to negotiate?" A Baltimore woman said, "It's not logical to think that we can agree on arms and be fighting all around the world. It's just not logical." These results (and comments in the earlier focus group discussions) suggest that a "mixed" strategy in which the superpowers agree to limit their competition to certain areas is confusing to many Americans and may be, in fact, one source of public discontent with the status quo. (See Table 15.)

In Summary: Muted Enthusiasm

People favor trying to eliminate the risk of a global holocaust, and a large majority feels that the Soviets are as interested as we are. Yet there is much uncertainty about Soviet cheating and whether the Soviets will abide by the agreements they sign. People do not believe nuclear weapons have kept the peace, but they are concerned about a conventional imbalance that might result from drastic nuclear arms reductions.

But it is not mainly their concern about either Soviet cheating or a conventional imbalance that mutes people's enthusiasm for this approach; rather, the main factor limiting support involves what this future would not do. It would not fundamentally alter the U.S.-Soviet relationship. It would not have the U.S. and the Soviet Union working together to solve common problems. Instead, this future envisions that the superpowers would continue to be adversaries and aggressively compete for influence around the globe. A woman from Chicago said, "Even if we did get rid of nuclear weapons, we would still have the ability to make them. And if we're still competing [with the Soviets], then you're always going to have the threat of [one country building new nuclear weapons and therefore the threat of] a nuclear war." This future envisions a world in which the superpowers have agreed to carefully manage the competition.

But the public's goal is to end the competition altogether, not manage it more safely. People are not interested in controlling the arms race or, as we shall see, even in trying to win it. Rather, they want the arms race to end but only alongside basic, fundamental change.

FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

In the world of Future One, the U.S. has gained clear military and political superiority over the Soviet Union; the U.S. has vigorously protected countries from Soviet or communist aggression, and has applied economic and political pressure against the Soviets and their allies. This future was people's third choice; 24% ranked it as their first preference and 15% named it second, giving it a combined first and second ranking of 39%. However, while this overall approach was not broadly supported, certain elements appealed to many respondents. Asked to rate this approach without comparison to the others, 49% said they strongly or somewhat favored it. Below, we discuss people's reservations about this future, then those aspects they found attractive. (See Tables 6 and 24.)

The Public's Reservations About this Approach:

1. A never-ending arms race: An important reason why gaining the upper hand (Future One) was unpopular involved the prospect of a never-ending arms race. A large majority (75%) felt that a convincing argument against this approach was that "trying to gain military superiority is a formula for an endless arms race." A Baltimore area woman said, "This [Future One] won't work. We build one [missile], they build one. We build two, they build three. It's a constant race to see how much we're going to build." A man from Baltimore said that even if the U.S. did gain the upper hand, the Soviets would simply work until they achieved parity. "We

TABLE 24: REACTION TO FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand. Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.

PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.

CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they're backed into a corner.

Views About Future One		Total	
		%	
Strongly Favor	Total in Favor	26	> 49
Somewhat Favor		23	
Somewhat Oppose	Total Opposed	17	> 41
Strongly Oppose		24	
Not Sure		10	

had the upper hand on them way back [in the 1950s]," he said. "And they caught up with us. If we get [an upper hand] again, they're going to catch up again." In fact, 83% agreed with the statement that if the U.S. did have a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets, "they would keep building until they caught up." (See Tables 23 and 25.)

2. The expense of trying to gain the upper hand: A second powerful reason for the lack of support involved cost. As many as 70% said that a convincing argument against this approach was that it would be too expensive "because it would mean enormous defense spending, year after year." A man from Nashville linked the costs of the arms race to technological advances. "Every time our technology advances," he said, "it opens new doors and [building new weapons] gets more expensive." A man from Seattle said, "There's one argument [in favor of this future] that if we keep building up nuclear arms, we can run [the Soviets] into the ground financially. But we'll run ourselves down too." A woman from Baltimore said, "Maybe the Soviets are willing to negotiate [arms reductions] now because they can't afford to run their economy and pay for their military at the same time. Well, guess what -- we can't afford it either! We're almost in as bad shape as they are." Indeed, there was widespread sentiment that U.S. domestic needs suffer because so much money is spent on defense. And large numbers were fearful that this pattern would continue. As many as 74% said that in the foreseeable

TABLE 25: REACTIONS TO THE ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FUTURE ONE

Pro Arguments:	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing
	%	%
The U.S. has an obligation to oppose Soviet and communist expansion and defend freedom around the world	55	33
The success of the Grenada invasion proves that we can and should try to stop communist expansion	40	46
We can gain the upper hand because we are wealthier than the Soviets and we have the edge in high technology	43	50
We are already in a winner-take-all competition with the Soviets and, realistically speaking, this is the only way to keep them at bay	30	55
Con Arguments:		
Trying to gain military superiority is a formula for an endless arms race	75	19
This future would be too expensive because it would mean enormous defense spending, year after year	70	21
Trying to stop communist expansion around the world will only lead to more Vietnams	49	38
This future would be too dangerous because the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat	48	37

future, it was either very or fairly likely that we will "neglect problems in the U.S. by spending so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race." (See Table 23.)

3. A dangerous approach: Near majorities also agreed with two other arguments against this approach: that trying to gain the upper hand "would only lead to more Vietnams" (49%) or "be too dangerous because the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat" (48%). A man from Seattle said, "This [approach] is frightening. We don't want to make them feel cornered. Anyone is dangerous when you put their back against the wall. But I'm especially worried about the 'Old Guard,' the ones who have been there for years, working for world domination. They'd really dangerous [if they were backed into a corner.]" A man from Baltimore added, "I don't like [this future]. I think there'd be a lot less tension if there was more parity in the nuclear arms race." (See Table 25.)

TABLE 26: VIEWS ABOUT POLICIES RELATED TO FUTURE ONE

Statement	Posttest Total Strg Favor	 Smwt Favor	 Smwt Oppse	 Strg Oppse	 NS
	%	%	%	%	%
We should build SDI even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms	26	30	20	19	6
Total in Favor/Opposed		56		39	
We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting	13	31	30	21	6
Total in Favor/Opposed		44		51	
We should aid anti-communist groups and governments even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy	10	29	28	25	8
Total in Favor/Opposed		39		53*	
We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights even if that means not signing any arms control agreement	12	24	35	23	5
Total in Favor/Opposed		36		58	

* Pretest result was 64% in favor, 31% opposed.

What the Public Liked About This Approach

1. Peace through strength: While the idea of gaining the upper hand was generally rejected, people deeply believe that the U.S. should be strong militarily and capable of resisting aggression. As noted earlier, in October, 1987, ATS/Marttila and Kiley found that 69% agreed that the recent Reagan Administration military buildup was necessary, and only 27% said it was unnecessary. In the panels, 71% agreed that "the Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any." A man from Seattle said, "I don't want our country to be weak. I want us to always be able to defend ourselves." A Seattle woman said, "I don't think we should try to be stronger than them. But we're in danger of losing [things that are vital to our national interest] if we're weaker than they are." (See Table 5.)

2. An obligation to defend freedom: A popular argument in favor of this future, endorsed by 54%, was that the U.S. has an obligation to oppose Soviet or communist expansion and defend freedom around the world. "And we're not just doing that [defending other countries] because we're nice guys," a man from San Antonio said. "We're doing it to protect ourselves, because it's in our interests." An impressively high 61% also agreed that it is U.S. strength that "keeps ruthless, aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world." A woman from Chicago said, "We

have to support these [developing] countries because if we don't, the communists will just take over. Castro is trying to take over all the Latin American countries and if we don't help, then what's going to happen?" (See Table 26.)

3. Qualified support for anti-communist groups and governments: Asked in the pretest whether the U.S. should help anti-communist groups and governments, 64% said, yes, that the U.S. should provide such assistance. However, when a particular trade-off was added to the question, support plummeted; only 39% said we should aid anti-communists even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy -- a 25 percentage point drop. A Baltimore man suggested the reason for the sharp decline in people's support. "We've become so anti-communist that we've developed a sort of weird mentality," he said. "We end up supporting anything because it's anti-communist. If Charlie Manson was anti-communist and lived in one of those [Third World] countries, we'd probably support him." (See Table 26.)

The two results, taken together, suggest that while most Americans want the U.S. to help governments and groups who are opposing Marxist or communist expansion, they do not feel that our support should be offered to every country or group, unconditionally. Rather, people want the U.S.

---

to be selective in deciding whom to help and to take a long-term view that weighs pragmatic factors such as the likelihood of success against other considerations including whether such support is in the country's long-term interests and whether it is consistent with U.S. ideals.

Finally, there remains widespread concern about the U.S. getting "dragged into" foreign conflicts. A sizable minority (44%) said the U.S. should provide increased military aid to help Third World countries fight communism, even if that means increasing the chances that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting. But 51% said they were opposed to this step. (See Table 29.)

4. Building SDI: Reactions to the policies related to this future suggest that the public's views about SDI are complex. In their October, 1987 survey for ATS, Marttila and Kiley found that 54% approved of the continued development of SDI or Star Wars. In the panels, 56%, said that the U.S. should build SDI even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear weapons. However, in response to another question, a comparable majority (59%) said they would give up SDI in order to forge a working partnership with the Soviets on common problems. The results suggest that improving the relationship is considered more important than a mere reduction in the numbers of nuclear

weapons. And taking all these results together suggests that the country might arrive at a consensus about continuing the SDI program, in some limited form -- at least until there is fundamental change in the overall U.S.-Soviet relationship. But a decision to shelve SDI completely has the potential to divide or even polarize the public. (See Tables 11 and 26.)

In Summary: Less than Total Rejection

Only a minority wants the U.S. to embark on a path to gain a military and political upper hand over the Soviet Union. This approach is considered to be too expensive, too dangerous and not feasible. But rejection of this approach as a whole should not be misinterpreted as rejection of all of its parts. To the contrary, majorities want the U.S. to be strong militarily, to defend freedom around the globe, to aid anti-communist groups and governments (at least when they share our basic values), and to go ahead with at least some version of the SDI program.

What the public largely rejects is clear: the cost of trying to gain the upper hand, which most also believe is ultimately futile. "Can we get the upper hand?" a man from Nashville asked. "We blow them up 10 times, they blow us up 20 times. This [Future One] to me is just impossible." But this approach is also rejected because of concern about defense spending, especially in view of perceptions about the depth of the domestic problems in the U.S. The depth of public concern about the relationship between defense spending and domestic problems will become even more apparent when we examine reactions to the fourth alternative, a future in which the U.S. pulls back from its global commitments and defends only the continent of North America (Future Four).

FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

Future Four presents a world in which, by the year 2010, the U.S. has gradually ended its alliances, withdrawn from its global commitments, redefined it security interests, and is actively defending only the continent of North America. This vision of the future was, in effect, totally rejected by people in the panels. Only 4% named this future as their first choice, and only 8% said it was their second choice -- a combined first or second preference of only 12%. However, these figures, by themselves, may be misleading since there were elements or aspects of this approach that large majorities support with enthusiasm. (See Table 6.)

The Public's Reservations About this Approach:

1. The U.S. cannot withdraw from the world: Reactions to this approach as a whole were both negative and strong. "This [future] is ridiculous," a Nashville woman said. "We're not a self-sufficient nation. There's no way we could ever pull this off." A Chicago area woman said, "We're too dependent on other people [and countries] and they're too dependent on us. Now, with [advances in] new technology, the world is getting smaller and smaller." A woman from Seattle said, "We're just so interwoven in every country economically and politically that we almost have to be there."

TABLE 27: REACTION TO FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America. Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.

PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.

CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world.

Views About Future Four		Total	
		%	
Strongly Favor	Total in Favor	14	> 29
Somewhat Favor		15	
Somewhat Oppose	Total Opposed	23	> 65
Strongly Oppose		42	
Not Sure		7	

People also believe that the United States has an important role to play as a world power. In part, this sentiment stems from the fact that people have a broad view of the country's self-interest. For example, 66% felt that a convincing argument against this future was that "if we pull back, many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons." A man from Seattle said, "If we pull back, [countries such as Japan and South Korea] will build up their troops and forces, and probably have more radical people [in charge of the government]." A man from Baltimore said, "[South] Korea depends on us to protect them. If we pull out, the first thing they'll do is go out shopping [around the world for a country that will sell them] their own nuclear weapons." (See Table 28.)

Also convincing were two other arguments related to this country's role in the world. A large majority (61%) felt that a convincing argument against this approach involves the lessons of history, that "history shows that it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless countries from starting trouble around the world." A Nashville area man said that U.S. troops stationed in other countries "is what keeps the balance. Even though we may be acting like the world's policeman," he said, "we're _trying_ to keep a balance in the arms race and all over the world." A man

TABLE 28: REACTIONS TO THE ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST FUTURE FOUR

Pro Arguments:	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing
	%	%
While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs	79	16
Being the "world's policeman" increases our chances of getting dragged into a nuclear war	58	34
Especially in view of our problems here in the US, we can't afford to defend so many nations	55	38
Our allies are perfectly capable of defending themselves and they can afford it	33	59
Con Arguments:		
If we pull back, many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons	66	22
History shows that it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world	61	28
Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and eventually leave us alone in a world filled with enemies	55	34
We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world	54	36

from Seattle said, "I don't think we can pull back like that, we have to maintain a presence. If we're not there, then other countries will move in." And a woman from Chicago said, "After World War I, we proved that we can't go back to an isolationist view."

Finally, 55% said that another convincing argument against Future Four was that "our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and eventually leave us alone in a world filled with enemies." A man from Chicago said, "No other country has the power to protect these countries like the U.S. does. [So if we pull out], they're going to end up making alliances with the Soviets." A Nashville man said, "I don't think we should pull our troops back because, if we did, [the Soviets] would run over everybody to get whatever they need. Like in Vietnam -- we pulled out and [the communists] were right there." A woman from Nashville said, "We'd be giving the Soviet Union the whole rest of the world." (See Table 28.)

What the Public Liked About This Approach

1. The costs of defending so many countries: While people rejected the idea that by 2010, the U.S. should be defending only North America, large majorities agreed with certain arguments that accompanied this option. Although they rejected the conclusion, many felt that at least some of the underlying rationale made considerable sense. As many as 79% said

TABLE 29: VIEWS ABOUT POLICIES RELATED TO FUTURE FOUR

Statement	Posttest Total				
	Strg Favor	Smwt Favor	Smwt Oppse	Strg Oppse	NS
	%	%	%	%	%
We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues	37	41	11	4	7
Total in Favor/Opposed	78		15		
We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets	7	13	28	49	4
Total in Favor/Opposed	20		77		
We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America, even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies	4	8	21	64	3
Total in Favor/Opposed	12		85		
We should aid anti-communist groups and governments in the Third World even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy	10	29	28	25	8
Total in Favor/Opposed	39		53		
We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism, even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting.	13	31	30	21	6
Total in Favor/Opposed	44		51		

---

that a convincing argument for this future is that "while we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs." A man from Chicago said, "While we're on the front lines [in Korea] getting shot at, they're selling us cars and taking away our jobs. Why can't they defend their own country? Why do we have to do it?" (See Tables 28 and 29.)

A smaller number, though still a majority (55%), also found convincing the argument that in view of domestic problems, the U.S. "can't afford to defend so many nations." A man from Baltimore added, "We're bankrupting ourselves [by defending so many countries around the world]. They [our allies] can afford to defend themselves, sure they can. Right now, they're getting a free trip." A woman from San Antonio said, "If we don't take care of things here [in the U.S.], we'll just destroy ourselves while we worry about the Soviet Union." (See Table 28.)

2. The feeling that our allies should carry more of the burden: Consistent with the result cited above was the very strong support people gave to one of the policy particulars related to Future Four. As many as 78% favored making our allies pay more of the cost of their own defense, even if that means losing influence over them on economic issues. A man from Nashville said, "I do think that other countries like Japan and

---

Germany need to be more responsible for themselves [and their own defense]. As long as we play the policeman's role, they'll let us because it doesn't cost them anything and they'll get all the profits." A Baltimore man was even more passionate. "We're going down the same path that the Roman Empire went down," he said. "We're playing 'Big Brother' all over the world but we're 'Big Brothering' ourselves right down the drain. I'm talking about the Japanese owning new York City. I talking about Germany who puts up absolutely nothing for its own defense." (See Table 29.)

In Summary: "Burden-Sharing" but not Isolationism

The idea that the U.S. should redefine its commitments and withdraw to defend only the continent of North America was totally rejected. People feel that the U.S. must remain a global power for several reasons: first, they think that the country has an obligation or moral responsibility to defend freedom and help countries defend themselves against aggression; second, people believe that U.S. strength has kept the peace and they worry about the effects of withdrawal; and third and most important, people feel that it is in this country's national interests to have strong alliances both for reasons of national security and because of America's economic interdependence with other nations.

However, large numbers of people did support particular aspects or elements related to this approach. There was broad support for making U.S. allies pay more of the cost of their own defense, with 79% saying that we spend billions to defend countries who are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs. Also, a majority expressed the view that the costs of current U.S. commitments are more than the country can bear, given current domestic needs. And so the intensity of the sentiments underlying this view should not be underestimated just because the future itself was soundly rejected.

CHAPTER THREE: THE PUBLIC'S JUDGMENT

Changes from the Pre- to the Posttest

In our earlier research, including the 1984 Voter Options study, the Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development had learned that Americans' thinking about many aspects of the U.S.-Soviet relations/nuclear arms issue was marked by inconsistency and conflict. We had also learned that a principal source of that inconsistency involved what people said they wanted in the short- and long-term.

A fundamental goal of this project was to encourage people to keep both short- and long- term considerations in mind as they weighed what they wanted the country to do over the next twenty years. So we designed and presented the four futures in a way that would minimize the tendency of people to engage in wishful thinking. Research featuring a "fantasyland" vision, bearing no resemblance to what experts and policy makers see as the realistic options, would be virtually worthless to those who are seriously concerned about American public opinion. For that reason, none of the futures presented a utopian vision; none discussed, for example, world government or the arrival of a western-style, two-party democracy inside the Soviet Union. To the contrary, each future was presented along with realistic estimates of its costs and risks as determined by some of the country's most distinguished foreign policy experts.

In view of our research design, it was not surprising that people's initial reactions to the futures were much more positive than their considered judgments. Predictably, before they had time to consider the pro and con arguments and to think about the relationship of short-term steps to long-term goals, people tended to want almost all of the futures, in spite of the deep incompatibilities among them. When asked to rate the futures separately in the pretest, upwards of 70% favored three of them. At this stage of the process, people had not begun to differentiate; their first (and understandable) reaction was to favor alternatives that, however attractive, were in fact logically incompatible.

The change between between the pretest and the posttest was dramatic. People's assessment became much more selective, and their support for all the futures decreased from the pre- to the posttest; in three cases, the decrease was striking.

As we have noted, Future Three remained people's first choice; but it was even more popular at first hearing. In the pretest, a whopping 93% said they favored developing a relationship where the superpowers would cooperate to solve common problems. However, after considering the arguments for and against this future (including the costs and risks),

TABLE 30: COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST VIEWS ABOUT THE FUTURES

	Pretest %		Posttest %		Net %
Future One: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand					
Strongly Favor	32		26		
Total in Favor		>71		>49	-22
Somewhat Favor	39		23		
Somewhat Oppose	11		17		
Total Opposed		>20		>41	+21
Strongly Oppose	9		24		
Not Sure	9		10		
Future Two: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise					
Strongly Favor	64		21		
Total in Favor		>89		>55	-34
Somewhat Favor	25		34		
Somewhat Oppose	6		21		
Total Opposed		> 9		>34	+23
Strongly Oppose	3		13		
Not Sure	3		11		
Future Three: Cooperative Problem-Solving					
Strongly Favor	77		39		
Total in Favor		>93		>70	-23
Somewhat Favor	16		31		
Somewhat Oppose	3		13		
Total Opposed		> 6		>21	+15
Strongly Oppose	3		8		
Not Sure	2		9		
Future Four: Defend Only North America					
Strongly Favor	13		14		
Total in Favor		>33		>29	-4
Somewhat Favor	20		15		
Somewhat Oppose	25		23		
Total Opposed		>61		>65	+4
Strongly Oppose	36		42		
Not Sure	6		7		

and after weighing the the policies required to implement it, the number who favored Future Three dropped by 23 percentage points, from 93% to 70%. This result suggests that wishful thinking was kept to a minimum, and that the posttest preference reflects people's considered judgments about which course the U.S. should follow. Even with this decrease, Future Three was people's preferred option, with 70% in favor and only 21% opposed. (See Table 30.)

Support for eliminating the nuclear threat while otherwise competing (Future Two) also dropped sharply from the pre- to the posttest. Whereas 89% favored this option initially, 55% favored this approach after weighing the tradeoffs and considering the risks and costs, a decrease of 34 percentage points. But in spite of these reductions posttest favorability was still comparatively high, with supporters outnumbering opponents by 55% to 34%.

Support for gaining the upper hand (Future One) also decreased sharply, from 70% in favor in the pretest to 49% in the posttest, a drop of 21 percentage points. In the posttest, people were split about the wisdom of this approach, with nearly as many against (41%) as for (49%).

Only with defending only North America (Future Four) was there little change in people's thinking. The numbers in favor in the pretest were nearly identical to the posttest totals. In the pretest, this option was opposed by 61% to 33%, and in the posttest by 65% to 29% -- a drop of only four percentage points. These results suggest that people's initial views about this option were very close to their considered judgment; that is, people had already "worked though" their feelings about the wisdom of having the U.S. redefine its commitments and pull back to a defense of only the North American continent; people had rejected this option in advance. (See Table 30.)

The Public's Composite Future

The four futures were important for two reasons: first, we wanted to get people's reactions to each future as it was presented. But our second goal was to use the futures as a framework from which to draw conclusions about how people felt about elements from all the futures. We wanted to see how people put the policies and arguments together themselves. In short, one of the things we hoped to discover was what the public's "composite" future would be if people took into consideration realistic tradeoffs, risks and costs.

By looking at the broadly supported elements related to each future and reactions to the arguments for and against each one, we can surmise what the public composite future includes. First and most important, people want to change the nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship; they want to end the Cold War and have the superpowers work together to address common problems. People see such a change, not as a utopian wish, but as a pragmatic response to a world in which the greatest danger we face is no longer direct Soviet aggression but an array of problems that threaten the Soviet Union as well as the U.S. (such as the spread of nuclear weapons, terrorism, disease, pollution and the management of nuclear power). And, people feel, it is superpower hostility that keeps us (and the Soviets) from turning our attention to these problems. However, people have concerns about Soviet intentions and whether the Soviets would agree to such a course. And they worry about sharing high technology, giving up SDI and, in general, moving too quickly (or naively) in this direction.

Second, people want to eliminate the risk of nuclear annihilation by drastically cutting back the size of the superpower arsenals and negotiating agreements to make sure that the superpowers do not get dragged into regional conflicts, thereby setting off a global war. But while people feel that the Soviets are truly interested in such steps, they are also concerned about possible Soviet cheating and about agreements that result in a conventional force imbalance. There is also widespread public concern about possible Soviet aggression and/or support for communist insurgencies in the Third World; and people doubt that the superpowers can compartmentalize their differences by, for example, agreeing to drastic nuclear arms reductions while simultaneously engaging in armed competition in the Third World.

Third, the public believes that the U.S. should be strong militarily. People believe that U.S. weakness will invite aggression and that U.S. strength has kept the peace. People also want the SDI program to go forward in some fashion -- at least unless there is a fundamental change in the overall U.S.-Soviet relationship. However, they believe that the arms race is unwinnable, and that trying to gain "the upper hand" over the Soviets would be too expensive and ultimately futile.

Fourth, the public rejects the idea that the U.S. should withdraw from commitments, but a large majority would like the allies to pay more of the cost of their own defense. People are concerned about the effect of defense spending on U.S. domestic needs and worry about the country's ability to compete in the international economy.

Finally and perhaps most important, all the results taken together suggest that though Americans want a fundamental change in U.S.-Soviet relations that effectively ends the Cold War, they do not want to pursue such a course quickly or recklessly. Rather, people want to work for change gradually, a step at a time, and have the U.S. constantly assess and reassess Soviet intentions and behavior.

SUMMARY

The Reagan-Gorbachev summits have ushered in a new era of public thinking about nuclear arms and the Soviet Union. Americans feel that the arms race is not winnable and they would like to see it end; in the future, people would like to see a fundamental change in relations with the Soviets that would include drastic nuclear arms reductions and the formation of a working partnership on common problems such as the spread of nuclear weapons, terrorism, and nuclear power plant safety.

However, the public is not ready to declare peace. Many people feel that the U.S. was deceived during detente and that the recent military build up was necessary. And now, while most Americans are hopeful about the new Soviet leadership, they remain wary about the Soviets and their motives. The public is taking a wait-and-see attitude and is willing to support the U.S. taking small steps to test Soviet intentions. But the outcome may depend on what the Soviets do. In effect, the Soviets are on probation or on trial in terms of U.S. public opinion.

The current mood is different from anything we've seen. It is unlike the 1950s and 1960s when the Soviets were seen as threatening nuclear war. It is also unlike the 1970s and the early 1980s when the public's thinking swung from one extreme to another. Today, while the Soviets are mistrusted and still regarded as a dangerous adversary, they are also believed to be rational and predictable -- and thus no more interested in

---

nuclear war than we are. In fact, more than 80% believe the Soviets genuinely want to reduce the size of nuclear arsenals, and a large majority feels that the Soviets are potential partners on a range of common problems. Below, we summarize what has and has not changed in terms of public opinion.

What has changed:

1. The Soviets are no longer seen as a nuclear threat;
2. The public feels that the arms race cannot be won and they would, in the future, like to see it end because:
   - The arms race is felt to be too expensive;
   - The Soviets are felt to be truly interested in sharply cutting both sides' nuclear arsenals;
   - The argument that arsenals should not be reduced because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since World War II is rejected;
   - They oppose directly linking human rights with arms control agreements;
   - And they feel that there is little danger in signing an arms agreement in the short term;
3. In the future, people would like to radically change our relationship with the Soviets so that the countries work together on a range of common problems.

What has not changed:

1. The Soviets are not trusted; many assume they will cheat on any arms agreements -- however most do not believe that this, by itself, is reason not to sign;
2. The Soviets are seen as intent on expanding communism in the Third World and ready to take advantage of any weakness;
3. The U.S. must be strong and continue to be a world power, in large part because people say that U.S. strength has kept the peace:
   - But people feel that the U.S. spends too much to defend other countries and that our allies should do more;
   - And they are concerned about the U.S. being the "world's policeman."

In sum, a new set of questions are on the public's mind, questions that involve Soviet intentions toward their neighbors, in the Third World and about arms control agreements. More than anything, how Americans answer these questions will depend on Soviet actions and people's perceptions of Soviet intentions.

APPENDIX I

A Comparative Analysis of the Futures

The first three categories of this four-page matrix and the last category are "analytical." All other propositions are stated as they are argued by each Future's advocates. All statements are necessarily highly succinct.

FUTURE 1	FUTURE 2	FUTURE 3	FUTURE 4
Concept of Security			
U.S. security rests on our success in achieving superiority over our main adversary, the Soviet Union. Security is achieved by unilateral, not mutual, action.	The U.S. and the USSR have a strong common interest in preventing the nuclear war that could destroy them both. In other respects, we must try to outdistance them. Security is achieved partly by mutual, partly by unilateral, action.	Real security, including the prevention of nuclear war, cannot be achieved without a great improvement in superpower relations. To achieve this we would work together on specific problems that are common to both nations. Security is achieved largely by mutual action.	America's security would no longer be greatly affected by events elsewhere in the world. We would only defend North America. Therefore, Soviet actions would be much less important to us. Security is achieved by unilateral, not mutual, action.
Character of the Relationship			
Is and must be a zero-sum game.	Can become positive-sum game in one major respect.	Can become substantially a positive-sum game.	The entire game is not terribly important.
Idea of How a Nuclear War Might Occur			
Nuclear war would be the result of Soviet aggression, and the ceaseless Soviet effort to expand their power.	Nuclear war would be the result of miscalculation and uncontrolled escalation in a crisis, or of an accident.	Nuclear war would fundamentally be the result of the tremendous hostility and fear between the two sides.	Nuclear war involving the U.S. would be the result of the U.S. being involved in too many dangerous places around the world.
Advanced Nuclear Weapons			
Development of new weapons is essential, since we have to keep ahead of the Soviets in all military areas.	Development of new weapons would be halted by verifiable agreements between the superpowers.	We would maintain and develop sufficient weapons to deter nuclear attack on us or our allies, only for as long as necessary.	We would maintain a nuclear force strong enough to deter any nuclear weapon attack only on North America, developing new weapons as needed.
Defense Against Soviet Missiles			
Missile defenses would be vigorously pursued, no matter what the Soviets say or do, and deployed as soon as feasible.	Missile defenses would be regarded as an important bargaining chip in arms control negotiations (unless the Soviets agree to limited defenses on both sides).	Same as Future 2	Same as Future 1
Arms Control Negotiations			
Agreements would be made only if the U.S. does not give up anything needed to achieve superiority, and only if we can be sure of no Soviet cheating.	We would press for drastic cuts in both sides' nuclear arsenals, on a basis of strict mutual verification and on-site inspection.	Improved relations will facilitate nuclear arms cuts, so our first priority must be to achieve a less hostile relationship.	Arms control is not terribly important. We would pursue such negotiations only to reduce the number of offensive Soviet weapons, allowing us to reduce the number we need to deter Soviet attack.

A Comparative Analysis of the Futures (cont'd)

FUTURE 1	FUTURE 2	FUTURE 3	FUTURE 4
Use of Nuclear Weapons			
We would continue to threaten first use of nuclear weapons (as we have for decades), if necessary, to stop Soviet non-nuclear aggression in Europe, Korea and elsewhere.	We would gradually reduce our reliance on the threat of using nuclear weapons to deter a Soviet non-nuclear attack on our allies.	By reducing tensions, we would reduce the real risk of war, thus reducing our need to threaten to use nuclear weapons.	By withdrawing our overseas commitments, we would no longer need to threaten the first use of nuclear weapons.
Our Allies			
We would maintain and improve our strong alliances and keep American troops and nuclear weapons in Europe, South Korea, and elsewhere.	We would maintain strong alliances, while seeking agreed arms reductions with the Soviets, both nuclear and conventional.	We would maintain our alliances for the time being, but they would lose their importance as East-West hostility declines.	We would phase out all our alliances except Canada and Mexico. Our former allies would arrange for their own security, which could mean forming their own alliance or accommodating to Moscow.
Military Intervention Abroad			
We would intervene militarily where American interests are at stake, when we are able to apply enough forces to succeed at acceptable costs.	Both sides would not intervene and work for stability wherever there is risk of escalation to nuclear war, but continue to back their friends in Third World countries where there is no such risk.	Reduced U.S.-Soviet hostility will lead to a greater degree of tolerance towards "unfriendly" governments, and more efforts, separately or jointly, to resolve conflicts peacefully.	We would not intervene anywhere against Marxist governments or movements unless they directly threaten North America.
Central America and Cuba			
We would strongly oppose all Soviet-oriented regimes, for example by backing the Nicaraguan rebels. Cuba would continue under boycott.	We would continue to oppose, and the Soviets to promote, Marxist regimes, except where such actions could lead to U.S.-Soviet confrontation.	We would seek businesslike, non-ideological relations with all nations, including Cuba and Nicaragua, so long as they do the same.	The U.S. would leave Nicaragua and Cuba alone, unless they do things that threaten our own security.
Human Rights			
Soviet tyranny is a major evil. We would not only deplore it, but refuse to deal with the Soviets on other issues until they yield on this one.	We would press the Soviets on human rights, but not to the point of obstructing progress in reducing the nuclear threat.	Improving relations with the United States would give the Soviets a growing stake in improved human rights practices.	We would denounce Soviet repression as an affront to our principles but would take no concrete steps. Because we would not be allied to dictators overseas, our championing of human rights would be principled and consistent.
Economic Consequences			
Costs will be considerable, and are likely to mean some increase in taxes and/or decrease in domestic Federal spending. (But advocates say it would be enormously more costly to let the Soviets come to dominate the world.)	Costs are uncertain. If a buildup in conventional forces is needed, costs could be somewhat higher that in the 1980s (but not as high as in Future 1). If the two sides agree to reduce conventional forces, costs will be lower than in the 1980s.	Costs will decline, although the speed of decline is uncertain as it depends on declining hostility. Advocates say long-term savings will be huge. Critics say our playing into the Soviet hands will necessitate an enormous military build-up later.	Costs are uncertain. Withdrawing our foreign commitments would mean very great savings. But much of this could be eaten up by a large-scale program to defend against ballistic and cruise missiles.

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Harold M. Agnew
Former Chief Executive Officer, GA Technologies
Member, White House Science Council

Professor Madeleine Albright
School of Foreign Service
Georgetown University

Dr. Lew Allen, Jr.
Director, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

Professor Graham T. Allison
Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Vice Admiral John A. Baldwin
President, Naval War College

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago

Professor Seweryn Bialer
Director, Research Institute on International Change
Columbia University

Dr. Ernest Boyer
Former U.S. Commissioner of Education
President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Mr. Lawrence E. Bruce, Jr.
President, U.S. Committee for UNICEF

Professor McGeorge Bundy
Former Special Assistant to the President
 for National Security Affairs
Department of History, New York University

Mr. Willard C. Butcher
Chairman, The Chase Manhattan Bank

National Council

Mr. Louis W. Cabot
Chairman, Cabot Corporation

Mr. Philip Caldwell
Senior Managing Director, Shearson Lehman Brothers

Ms. Antonia Handler Chayes
Former Under Secretary of the Air Force
Chairman, Endispute

The Honorable Warren Christopher
Former Deputy Secretary of State
O'Melveny and Myers

The Honorable Henry Cisneros
Mayor of San Antonio

The Honorable Harlan Cleveland
Former U.S. Ambassador to NATO
Dean, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

The Honorable Clark M. Clifford
Former Secretary of Defense
Clifford and Warnke

The Honorable William Colby
Former Director of Central Intelligence
Colby, Bailey, and Associates

The Honorable Martha Layne Collins
Governor of the State of Kentucky

Mr. Edward H. Crane
President, Cato Institute

Ms. Mary Dent Crisp
Former Co-Chair, Republican National Committee
Senior Advisor, Business Executives for National Security

Dr. Lynn E. Davis
Former Deputy to the Under Secretary of Defense
Director of Studies, International Institute
for Strategic Studies

National Council

Mr. William M. Detweiler
Chairman, Foreign Relations Commission
The American Legion

*The Honorable Douglas Dillon
Former Secretary of the Treasury
Brunt & Company

Ms. Mary Anne Dolan
Journalist
The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner

Professor Paul Doty
Center for Science and International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Father Robert F. Drinan
Former Member of Congress
Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center

The Honorable Lawrence S. Eagleburger
Former Under Secretary of State
President, Kissinger Associates

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Ms. Randall Forsberg
Executive Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies

The Honorable Henry H. Fowler
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Dr. Marvin Goldberger
Director, Institute for Advanced Study

The Honorable Arthur A. Hartman
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Andrew Heiskell
Former Chairman of the Board, TIME Incorporated

The Honorable Richard Helms
Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency
President, Safeer Company

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh
President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame

Mr. Arnold L. Horelick
Director, RAND/UCLA Program in Soviet International Behavior
RAND Corporation

Dr. Matina Horner
President, Radcliffe College

The Honorable William H. Hudnut, III
Mayor of Indianapolis

Professor Samuel P. Huntington
Director, Center for International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

*The Honorable William J. Hyland
Former Deputy Special Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
Editor, Foreign Affairs

Admiral B. R. Inman
Former Director, National Security Agency

General David C. Jones
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

*The Honorable Amos A. Jordan
Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
President and Chief Executive Officer
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Professor Barbara Jordan
Former Member of Congress
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin

The Honorable George F. Kennan
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.
The Institute for Advanced Study

The Honorable Juanita Kreps
Former Secretary of Commerce
Professor of Economics, Duke University

Admiral Gene R. La Rocque
Director, Center for Defense Information

Lt. General Richard D. Lawrence, U.S. Army (ret.)
Former President, National Defense University
Cambridge International

Ms. Flora Lewis
Foreign News Columnist
The New York Times

*Dr. Walter E. Massey
Vice President for Research
and for Argonne National Laboratory
The University of Chicago

*The Honorable David Mathews
Former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare
President, Charles F. Kettering Foundation

*The Honorable Charles McC. Mathias
Former Senator, State of Maryland
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue

The Honorable David E. McGiffert
Former Assistant Secretary of Defense
Covington & Burling

The Honorable Donald McHenry
Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service

The Honorable Robert S. McNamara
Former Secretary of Defense

*General Edward C. Meyer
Former Army Chief of Staff

The Honorable Patsy T. Mink
Former Member of Congress
Honolulu City Council

Ms. Nancy M. Neuman
Chair, League of Women Voters

Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr.
Former Deputy to the Under Secretary of State
Director, Center for Science and International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government

Professor Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.
President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

Dr. Sally K. Ride
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

*Dr. Alice M. Rivlin
Director, Economic Studies Program
The Brookings Institution

The Honorable George Romney
Former Governor of the State of Michigan

Professor Eugene V. Rostow
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law and Diplomacy
National Defense University

Mr. William M. Roth
President, Roth Properties

Mr. John Sawhill
Director, McKinsey & Company

Professor Robert Scalapino
Department of Political Science
University of California at Berkeley

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Dr. William Schneider
Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute
for Public Policy Research

Mr. Bernard L. Schwartz
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Loral Corporation

Mr. Albert Shanker
President, American Federation of Teachers

National Council

Dr. John R. Silber
President, Boston University

The Honorable William E. Simon
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Mr. Walter Slocombe
Former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
Caplin & Drysdale

The Honorable Gerard C. Smith
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
President, The Consultants International Group

Major General Perry M. Smith, U.S.A.F. (ret.)
Former Commandant, National War College

The Honorable Helmut Sonnenfeldt
Former Counselor to the Secretary of State
Guest Scholar, Foreign Policy Studies

Mr. Edson W. Spencer
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Honeywell

Mr. Kenneth A. Steadman
Director, National Security and Foreign Affairs
Veterans of Foreign Wars

*Dr. Howard R. Swearer (Chairman, Executive Committee)
President, Brown University

Mr. Robert Teeter
President, Market Opinion Research

Dr. Lewis Thomas
President Emeritus, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

The Honorable Richard Thornburgh
Former Governor of the State of Pennsylvania

Major General Harold W. Todd
Commandant
Air War College
Air University

Professor Robert W. Tucker
School of Advanced International Studies
The Johns Hopkins University

Admiral Stansfield Turner
Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency

Professor Adam B. Ulam
Director, Russian Research Center
Harvard University

*The Honorable Cyrus R. Vance
Former Secretary of State and Deputy Secretary of Defense
Chairman, The Public Agenda Foundation
Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett

Dr. Frank E. Vandiver
President, Texas A&M University

General Wilma L. Vaught, U.S.A.F. (ret.)
Advisor, The Jane Addams Conference
on Security in the Nuclear Age

The Honorable Arlene Violet
Former Attorney General of the State of Rhode Island

Ms. Jane Wales
Director, The Security Options Project

The Honorable Paul C. Warnke
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Clifford and Warnke

*The Honorable Thomas J. Watson, Jr.
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.
Chairman Emeritus, IBM Corporation

Mr. Fred Wertheimer
President, Common Cause

Mr. Tom Wicker
Political Columnist
The New York Times

The Honorable R. James Woolsey
Former Under Secretary of the Navy
Shea & Gardner

National Council

*Mr. Daniel Yankelovich
President, The Public Agenda Foundation
Chairman, The Daniel Yankelovich Group, Inc.

The Honorable Coleman Young
Mayor of Detroit

*Executive Committee member

THE PUBLIC, THE SOVIETS, AND NUCLEAR ARMS:
PUBLIC SUMMIT '88

PUBLICATIONS

The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms: An Information Kit (1987). Describes the multi-year joint effort of Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development to explore and enhance the public's role in development of the country's long term policies for nuclear arms and U.S. Soviet relations. Includes information about Public Summit '88, a citizen information campaign conducted in cooperation with local television and newspapers in four cities in January 1988. Single copies available free of charge.

The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms: A Perspective from Community Leaders (1987). Report on a series of workshops held with community leaders in ten cities examining issues such as deterrence, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and the spread of Marxism in the Third World. Conducted as part of the joint project between Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development. 62pp. Price: $10.00.

Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy: A Briefing Book for the 1984 Elections (1984). Part of the joint project between Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development. Report based on a 1984 indepth study of Americans' views about nuclear arms, the Soviets, arms control, and communism in the Third World, and an analysis of opinion data on these issues since 1945. Outlines areas of consensus and confusion among Americans and contrast public opinion, elite views and existing policy options. 90pp. Price: $6.00. Technical Appendix: $10.00.

U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future (1988). Final report on a research study of nearly one thousand citizens on the future of U.S.-Soviet relations, conducted jointly by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University. 120pp. Price $10.00. Technical Appendix: Forthcoming. Also available, summary ballot results from Public Summit '88, the joint citizen information campaign of Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development, and conducted in cooperation with local television stations and newspapers in four cities across the country. Price: $5.50.

R 8825-5,2F 8/88

THE PUBLIC,
THE SOVIETS,
AND NUCLEAR ARMS

PUBLIC
SUMMIT '88

A JOINT PROJECT OF THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION AND
THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

U.S. SOVIET RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2010;

AMERICANS LOOK TO THE FUTURE

Technical Appendix
by Stephen Immerwahr

This Report Is The Result Of A Joint Project By

The Public Agenda Foundation and

The Center For Foreign Policy Development At Brown University

A JOINT PROJECT OF
THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION
AND THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN
POLICY DEVELOPMENT
AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

THE PUBLIC, THE SOVIETS, AND NUCLEAR ARMS

U.S. SOVIET RELATIONS IN THE YEAR 2010; AMERICANS LOOK TO THE FUTURE

Technical Appendix

by Stephen Immerwahr

This Report Is The Result Of A Joint Project By
The Public Agenda Foundation and
The Center For Foreign Policy Development At Brown University

Public Agenda Foundation, 6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016 212•686•6610
Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, Box 1948, Providence, Rhode Island 02912 401•863•3465

Copyright 1988 by the Public Agenda Foundation

All rights reserved, including the rights to
reproduce this book or any portions thereof
in any form.

For more information contact:
The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

or

The Center for Foreign Policy Development at
Brown University
Box 1948
Providence, R.I. 02912

Public Summit '88 is a nonpartisan education and communications project designed to help Americans understand the choices that our country faces in areas of U.S.-Soviet relations and nuclear arms.

This project was co-sponsored by:
The Public Agenda Foundation
and
Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development.

PROJECT FUNDERS

Funding for The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms has been provided by the following institutions:

The Bohen Foundation

The Carnegie Corporation

The Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation

The George Gund Foundation

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The Charles F. Kettering Foundation

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

The James C. Penney Foundation, Inc.

The Veatch Program

THE PUBLIC AGENDA FOUNDATION

The Public Agenda Foundation is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and education organization, founded in 1975 by former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and public opinion analyst Daniel Yankelovich. Public Agenda works with media and other organizations to develop innovative ways of presenting complex issues to the public.

The Foundation has three types of programs, each designed to bring leadership, media and community groups together in a dialogue that heightens awareness about issues of national and local concern. In media-based public education campaigns, Public Agenda has worked with the media to stimulate open and constructive public debate on choices communities face on critical issues.

Each year, Public Agenda frames three topics for National Issues Forums in a set of issue books, setting down alternatives facing the American people - and their costs - and they are presented in hundreds of public gatherings where citizens can "work through" their different opinions to reach common ground.

Finally, independent research projects are undertaken to understand not only what people think about complex issues, but why they think it: these projects use a variety of research techniques renging from focused group discussions to full-scale national opinion studies.

THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, is a nonprofit organization established in 1981 on the initiative of Thomas J. Watson, Jr., former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Chairman Emeritus of IBM Corporation. Its mandate is to engage in research on U.S. policy for dealing with the Soviet Union and related weapons issues.

The Center brings together scholars, practitioners, and politicians and the public in a search for policy choices that can lead to consensus on the best way to reduce the risk of nuclear war while defending basic American values and interests.

The Center is separately incorporated but affiliated with Brown University and its newly-established Institute for International Studies. It is funded by grants from private individuals and foundations.

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This technical appendix is a companion volume to U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010, a report by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University describing the results of a study of public opinion conducted in January, 1988. The technical appendix has been prepared for scholars and others interested in a detailed examination of the results of a panel study with 963 Americans. The volume contains:

I. A question by question presentation of all "posttest" results showing key demographic breakdowns;

II. A presentation of results showing a comparison of those items used in both the pre- and posttests;

III. A presentation of the "pretest" results showing key demographic breakdowns;

IV. A detailed description of the research methodology used in the study, including:
  - ·A comparison of the panel's demographics to the demographics from national probability samples;
  - ·A comparison of the panel's responses on selected items to identical items from national surveys;

V. A copy of the questionnaires used in the study, and copies of the handouts given to respondents that review the chief arguments for and against each proposal.

I. POSTTEST SUMMARY TABLES

TABLE 1

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: SOVIETS WILL ATTACK OTHER NATIONS IN THE WAY THEY INVADED AFGHANISTAN

The Soviet Union will attack other nations in they way they invaded Afghanistan	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	27	39	26	8
Male	25	39	31	5
Female	29	39	22	11
White	26	40	27	8
Black	26	38	30	6
Hispanic	40	44	13	3
18-29	17	44	27	11
30-39	27	42	26	4
40-49	33	37	25	5
50-64	32	35	30	4
65 and over	28	39	25	9
H.S. grad/less	30	39	22	9
Some college	27	39	30	5
College grad	21	45	25	9
Post grad	22	36	38	4
Democrat	25	37	31	8
Independent/other	19	41	31	9
Republican	30	43	21	6
Seattle	16	33	44	7
Baltimore	26	34	27	13
Chicago	26	37	28	9
San Antonio	37	46	13	5
Nashville	31	45	20	5

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 2

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: SOONER OR LATER, THE SOVIETS WILL LAUNCH AN ALL-OUT NUCLEAR ATTACK ON THE U.S.

Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all-out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S.	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	8	12	75	5
Male	6	7	84	3
Female	9	18	67	6
White	6	11	79	4
Black	9	17	69	5
Hispanic	18	13	63	6
18-29	5	11	80	3
30-39	8	10	79	4
40-49	7	13	75	5
50-64	6	15	72	7
65 and over	11	12	73	5
H.S. grad/less	11	14	70	5
Some college	6	12	77	4
College grad	3	9	84	4
Post grad	3	6	87	3
Democrat	7	12	75	5
Independent/other	7	8	81	4
Republican	5	13	77	4
Seattle	5	7	84	5
Baltimore	8	15	73	4
Chicago	4	16	74	6
San Antonio	13	17	66	4
Nashville	7	8	81	4

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 3

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: THE ARMS RACE WILL EVENTUALLY LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR

The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	13	29	51	7
Male	13	26	54	7
Female	13	32	48	7
White	11	28	54	7
Black	19	41	35	5
Hispanic	17	32	42	9
18-29	11	33	49	7
30-39	10	37	45	8
40-49	16	27	52	5
50-64	15	28	51	7
65 and over	12	20	60	9
H.S. grad/less	10	32	50	8
Some college	15	27	50	9
College grad	13	29	55	3
Post grad	12	27	56	5
Democrat	16	30	46	7
Independent/other	13	28	48	11
Republican	10	28	57	5
Seattle	14	29	51	6
Baltimore	17	32	47	5
Chicago	12	27	51	11
San Antonio	13	31	51	5
Nashville	10	28	53	10

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 4

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: WE WILL DAMAGE OUR ECONOMY BY SPENDING TOO MUCH TO DEFEND OTHER COUNTRIES

We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	30	44	22	4
Male	27	45	24	3
Female	32	43	20	4
White	29	45	23	4
Black	34	47	13	5
Hispanic	31	39	29	--
18-29	31	45	20	4
30-39	30	38	28	4
40-49	19	51	26	4
50-64	37	42	19	3
65 and over	35	45	17	3
H.S. grad/less	33	41	21	5
Some college	30	46	22	3
College grad	23	48	22	6
Post grad	27	46	24	3
Democrat	34	44	18	4
Independent/other	27	51	19	3
Republican	26	41	29	5
Seattle	33	47	18	2
Baltimore	31	43	20	7
Chicago	32	46	19	4
San Antonio	27	42	27	4
Nashville	28	42	27	3

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 5

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: WE WILL SIGN AN ARMS AGREEMENT THAT WILL LEAVE US IN A WEAK POSITION

We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	9	20	65	7
Male	6	20	69	5
Female	11	20	61	8
White	8	20	66	7
Black	11	25	58	6
Hispanic	12	18	68	3
18-29	6	19	67	7
30-39	7	26	62	5
40-49	8	16	71	5
50-64	11	17	67	6
65 and over	11	22	60	7
H.S. grad/less	13	19	58	10
Some college	6	23	68	3
College grad	5	20	70	6
Post grad	6	13	76	5
Democrat	9	16	69	6
Independent/other	6	16	73	4
Republican	10	24	60	6
Seattle	5	17	72	6
Baltimore	7	16	65	11
Chicago	11	21	61	7
San Antonio	12	25	61	3
Nashville	8	21	66	5

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 6

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: MISTRUST WILL KEEP US FROM WORKING WITH THE SOVIETS AGAINST REAL PROBLEMS, LIKE TERRORISM

Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	32	42	22	5
Male	29	43	24	4
Female	34	41	21	5
White	29	43	23	5
Black	42	37	15	6
Hispanic	44	36	20	--
18-29	34	44	20	2
30-39	30	46	19	5
40-49	33	39	24	5
50-64	28	46	21	5
65 and over	27	36	31	6
H.S. grad/less	34	43	18	6
Some college	32	43	21	4
College grad	28	38	31	3
Post grad	27	41	27	5
Democrat	37	41	18	4
Independent/other	25	43	27	5
Republican	27	44	24	5
Seattle	23	37	33	7
Baltimore	36	43	14	6
Chicago	40	39	17	4
San Antonio	34	44	21	1
Nashville	24	46	25	5

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 7

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: A REGIONAL WAR (LIKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST) WILL ESCALATE INTO ALL-OUT WAR

A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into an all-out war	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	14	39	38	8
Male	12	39	44	5
Female	17	40	33	11
White	13	40	39	8
Black	16	43	31	11
Hispanic	17	37	42	5
18-29	14	41	36	9
30-39	14	43	36	7
40-49	17	38	40	6
50-64	13	39	38	10
65 and over	9	39	44	8
H.S. grad/less	14	38	36	12
Some college	15	40	40	6
College grad	13	47	37	3
Post grad	10	38	46	6
Democrat	15	37	38	10
Independent/other	9	39	46	7
Republican	14	43	37	6
Seattle	10	44	38	7
Baltimore	20	40	33	7
Chicago	14	37	40	9
San Antonio	15	40	37	9
Nashville	13	35	44	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 8

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: THE U.S WILL ACT AS 'WORLD POLICEMAN AND GET INTO ANOTHER VIETNAM

The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	13	35	43	9
Male	13	35	45	7
Female	14	36	41	10
White	12	35	46	7
Black	12	45	25	17
Hispanic	26	32	36	6
18-29	11	44	38	8
30-39	17	37	40	6
40-49	17	35	42	6
50-64	10	31	46	13
65 and over	11	28	55	6
H.S. grad/less	16	32	41	11
Some college	11	38	45	5
College grad	12	39	41	9
Post grad	11	38	43	8
Democrat	16	37	38	9
Independent/other	16	32	45	8
Republican	10	35	49	6
Seattle	12	37	45	6
Baltimore	15	35	39	11
Chicago	15	35	42	6
San Antonio	14	36	42	8
Nashville	11	35	46	9

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 9

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: MARXISM/COMMUNISM WILL SPREAD TO MORE AND MORE COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD

Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	16	39	33	12
Male	16	41	33	10
Female	16	36	33	14
White	15	40	32	13
Black	14	34	42	10
Hispanic	24	35	36	5
18-29	13	36	38	14
30-39	15	37	38	9
40-49	12	45	33	9
50-64	21	41	24	14
65 and over	19	41	30	10
H.S. grad/less	18	39	30	13
Some college	14	40	34	12
College grad	16	37	39	9
Post grad	14	45	29	13
Democrat	13	37	38	12
Independent/other	10	46	30	13
Republican	21	41	29	10
Seattle	11	37	38	15
Baltimore	14	35	36	15
Chicago	18	37	36	8
San Antonio	21	44	25	10
Nashville	16	42	31	12

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 10

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: SOVIETS WILL INCREASE THEIR SUPPORT OF LYBIA AND OTHER TERRORISTS

The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Lybia and terrorist groups in the Middle East	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	22	47	22	9
Male	20	48	27	6
Female	24	47	17	13
White	21	48	22	8
Black	23	42	24	11
Hispanic	25	50	16	8
18-29	14	48	25	13
30-39	24	43	24	9
40-49	25	50	19	7
50-64	23	49	19	9
65 and over	24	48	24	4
H.S. grad/less	23	49	19	9
Some college	21	48	23	8
College grad	20	46	26	8
Post grad	18	44	28	10
Democrat	18	48	24	10
Independent/other	16	47	28	10
Republican	28	47	18	8
Seattle	13	42	34	11
Baltimore	18	49	21	12
Chicago	21	47	22	9
San Antonio	29	51	13	7
Nashville	27	45	21	7

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 11

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: A SMALLER COUNTRY (LIKE PAKISTAN OR ISRAEL) WILL EVENTUALLY USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	18	43	31	9
Male	19	44	30	7
Female	16	41	32	10
White	17	42	32	9
Black	17	50	25	8
Hispanic	13	44	39	4
18-29	17	50	25	8
30-39	17	43	30	10
40-49	18	39	35	8
50-64	16	43	29	11
65 and over	17	38	39	5
H.S. grad/less	18	39	34	9
Some college	15	46	32	8
College grad	22	49	23	6
Post grad	15	39	35	12
Democrat	18	43	31	8
Independent/other	15	49	26	10
Republican	18	42	32	8
Seattle	13	45	33	9
Baltimore	21	39	31	9
Chicago	18	42	30	11
San Antonio	15	46	31	8
Nashville	22	42	30	6

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 12

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: POOR COMMUNICATION WILL CAUSE A CONFLICT OR INCIDENT TO BECOME A CRISIS THAT THREATENS WAR

Poor communication will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	18	45	30	6
Male	18	43	36	4
Female	19	48	25	8
White	16	46	32	6
Black	22	49	19	10
Hispanic	30	43	25	2
18-29	17	54	24	5
30-39	22	41	34	3
40-49	18	45	30	7
50-64	20	44	27	10
65 and over	14	43	40	4
H.S. grad/less	17	47	28	8
Some college	20	43	33	4
College grad	16	50	30	4
Post grad	20	47	27	6
Democrat	20	45	28	7
Independent/other	20	47	30	3
Republican	15	47	32	6
Seattle	14	47	36	3
Baltimore	20	43	31	6
Chicago	20	47	25	7
San Antonio	21	41	32	6
Nashville	17	49	26	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 13

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: WE WILL NEGLECT PROBLEMS HERE BECAUSE WE SPEND SO MUCH ON THE ARMS RACE

We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	29	43	25	3
Male	25	45	27	3
Female	32	42	22	3
White	25	45	26	3
Black	41	47	11	2
Hispanic	35	41	21	3
18-29	30	43	24	3
30-39	33	41	24	2
40-49	24	45	29	2
50-64	27	52	19	2
65 and over	28	40	27	5
H.S. grad/less	31	42	24	3
Some college	29	43	25	3
College grad	21	51	25	3
Post grad	28	50	19	3
Democrat	36	46	15	3
Independent/other	28	52	20	--
Republican	20	40	37	3
Seattle	34	41	21	5
Baltimore	32	42	24	2
Chicago	30	42	26	2
San Antonio	26	45	27	2
Nashville	23	47	26	4

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 14

CURRENT POSSIBLE THREATS: NUCLEAR WEAPON WILL BE LAUNCHED ACCIDENTALLY

A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	8	18	64	10
Male	7	17	69	8
Female	10	18	60	12
White	7	16	68	9
Black	9	29	44	19
Hispanic	15	18	57	10
18-29	8	18	63	11
30-39	8	20	65	8
40-49	9	14	70	7
50-64	8	14	69	9
65 and over	7	23	56	14
H.S. grad/less	10	20	56	14
Some college	8	15	69	9
College grad	4	18	72	6
Post grad	4	16	77	3
Democrat	8	19	62	12
Independent/other	7	20	64	9
Republican	8	15	70	8
Seattle	3	20	66	10
Baltimore	13	18	61	8
Chicago	8	16	60	16
San Antonio	10	19	64	7
Nashville	6	14	70	10

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our country. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 15

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS WANT TO WORK WITH US TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS, SUCH AS THE ENVIRONMENT

The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	55	24	21
Male	61	20	19
Female	50	28	22
White	57	22	21
Black	48	35	18
Hispanic	49	28	23
18-29	62	21	17
30-39	59	25	16
40-49	56	27	17
50-64	42	23	34
65 and over	56	24	20
H.S. grad/less	47	29	25
Some college	60	22	18
College grad	65	17	18
Post grad	61	21	18
Democrat	57	23	21
Independent/other	58	23	19
Republican	52	27	21
Seattle	73	11	15
Baltimore	53	27	20
Chicago	49	24	28
San Antonio	49	30	22
Nashville	51	29	20

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 16

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS WANT TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR AS BADLY AS WE DO

Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	82	9	9
Male	85	8	8
Female	80	10	9
White	84	8	8
Black	74	15	10
Hispanic	75	11	14
18-29	84	8	9
30-39	82	7	11
40-49	83	9	9
50-64	78	12	10
65 and over	88	9	3
H.S. grad/less	76	12	11
Some college	84	7	9
College grad	89	5	7
Post grad	91	8	1
Democrat	85	7	8
Independent/other	85	7	8
Republican	81	11	9
Seattle	91	4	5
Baltimore	79	12	9
Chicago	79	9	12
San Antonio	78	13	10
Nashville	85	7	8

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 17

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: NO MATTER WHAT THEY SAY, THE SOVIETS REALLY WANT THE WORLD TO BE COMMUNIST AND WON'T STOP TRYING

No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	53	27	21
Male	54	28	18
Female	51	26	23
White	52	28	20
Black	47	29	24
Hispanic	63	15	21
18-29	41	40	19
30-39	51	31	18
40-49	58	22	20
50-64	57	19	24
65 and over	60	20	20
H.S. grad/less	52	24	24
Some college	55	28	17
College grad	48	32	20
Post grad	48	30	22
Democrat	46	32	22
Independent/other	45	31	25
Republican	63	20	16
Seattle	39	41	20
Baltimore	48	27	26
Chicago	53	29	18
San Antonio	65	17	19
Nashville	59	22	19

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 18

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS HAVE SO MANY PROBLEMS OF THEIR OWN THEY DON'T POSE MUCH OF A THREAT TO THE U.S.

The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S.	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	17	72	12
Male	20	69	11
Female	13	74	13
White	17	71	12
Black	13	78	9
Hispanic	15	75	10
18-29	14	71	15
30-39	13	81	6
40-49	15	78	7
50-64	18	70	13
65 and over	24	59	17
H.S. grad/less	16	71	14
Some college	16	74	10
College grad	20	72	8
Post grad	18	70	13
Democrat	18	70	12
Independent/other	19	69	11
Republican	14	76	11
Seattle	28	60	12
Baltimore	17	69	14
Chicago	12	73	15
San Antonio	12	80	8
Nashville	12	77	11

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 19

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BUILD STAR WARS, EVEN IF WE HAVE TO GIVE UP NUCLEAR ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called Star Wars or SDI) even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms with the Soviets	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	26	30	20	19	6
Male	32	29	20	16	3
Female	20	31	20	22	8
White	26	30	19	21	5
Black	18	35	29	13	5
Hispanics	33	34	25	6	2
18-29	24	30	23	17	6
30-39	29	25	23	23	1
40-49	23	29	19	25	5
50-64	27	31	23	13	7
65 and over	28	39	10	18	6
H.S. grad/less	29	36	17	12	6
Some college	26	27	18	23	6
College grad	21	27	28	21	3
Post grad	19	29	26	26	--
Democrat	20	26	23	24	7
Independent/other	17	36	18	25	5
Republican	36	32	17	11	4
Seattle	15	22	18	41	5
Baltimore	23	29	21	19	9
Chicago	23	32	25	15	6
San Antonio	38	33	20	6	3
Nashville	31	34	15	15	6

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 20

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: AID ANTI-COMMUNIST GROUPS, EVEN IF THEY DON'T BELIEVE IN DEMOCRACY

We should aid anti-communist groups and governments in the Third World even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	10	29	28	25	8
Male	13	32	27	23	5
Female	8	25	29	27	11
White	10	29	28	25	8
Black	10	25	30	27	8
Hispanics	18	30	32	17	3
18-29	7	30	28	26	9
30-39	11	30	29	21	9
40-49	7	32	29	27	7
50-64	9	27	28	27	9
65 and over	17	26	28	23	6
H.S. grad/less	8	29	27	24	12
Some college	12	31	29	24	5
College grad	13	26	30	29	2
Post grad	9	29	26	25	10
Democrat	6	26	30	31	8
Independent/other	10	30	23	30	8
Republican	17	33	28	16	6
Seattle	7	19	30	39	4
Baltimore	6	25	30	28	11
Chicago	10	30	27	22	10
San Antonio	16	35	26	15	7
Nashville	11	34	26	20	9

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 21

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH SOVIETS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS FACING US BOTH

We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries, even if the only way to gain their trust is sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	28	31	19	17	6
Male	27	31	19	19	4
Female	29	30	18	16	7
White	29	30	18	17	6
Black	24	41	19	13	4
Hispanics	22	32	22	21	2
18-29	30	30	20	15	6
30-39	27	36	17	16	5
40-49	32	31	12	21	5
50-64	24	31	23	18	5
65 and over	29	25	21	19	5
H.S. grad/less	24	31	19	18	7
Some college	30	31	18	16	5
College grad	28	32	16	21	2
Post grad	34	26	21	14	5
Democrat	33	34	15	14	5
Independent/other	35	28	23	12	3
Republican	21	28	20	24	7
Seattle	42	27	12	14	5
Baltimore	29	38	14	14	5
Chicago	29	28	19	18	6
San Antonio	16	27	32	22	4
Nashville	25	32	17	18	8

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 22

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BRING HOME TROOPS AND END TREATY COMMITMENTS, EVEN IF OUR ALLIES MIGHT MAKE CONCESSIONS TO THE SOVIETS

We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments, even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	7	13	28	49	4
Male	8	12	26	51	3
Female	6	15	29	47	4
White	6	13	28	50	3
Black	8	18	33	36	5
Hispanics	12	8	18	59	3
18-29	7	13	28	49	4
30-39	5	12	28	52	2
40-49	4	13	25	55	3
50-64	7	12	29	48	5
65 and over	13	18	26	40	3
H.S. grad/less	9	14	30	41	6
Some college	6	12	26	53	3
College grad	4	12	25	57	2
Post grad	7	14	25	54	--
Democrat	8	15	30	43	4
Independent/other	8	15	35	38	4
Republican	4	11	22	61	2
Seattle	10	19	25	42	3
Baltimore	6	14	38	39	3
Chicago	7	11	23	55	4
San Antonio	6	9	25	57	4
Nashville	6	13	27	50	4

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 23

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: RECOGNIZE AND ESTABLISH TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA, EVEN IF THAT MEANS STRENGTHENING A COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT

We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations, even if that means strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	10	26	22	32	10
Male	12	30	22	30	6
Female	9	22	23	34	13
White	10	27	21	33	10
Black	11	32	32	17	9
Hispanics	10	15	28	43	5
18-29	9	29	22	28	12
30-39	11	29	19	33	10
40-49	7	28	24	35	6
50-64	12	20	26	34	8
65 and over	15	25	19	32	9
H.S. grad/less	9	21	25	34	12
Some college	11	27	21	32	11
College grad	10	35	23	29	3
Post grad	15	33	14	32	5
Democrat	13	27	23	27	10
Independent/other	15	33	21	20	11
Republican	5	24	21	43	7
Seattle	25	32	15	18	10
Baltimore	8	28	25	31	9
Chicago	8	22	24	34	12
San Antonio	3	19	27	44	8
Nashville	7	30	21	32	10

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 24

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: AGREE TO CUT BOTH SIDES' MILITARY ARSENALS EVEN IF THAT MEANS THEY WOULD HAVE THE LARGEST ARMY IN THE WORLD

We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	17	30	19	28	6
Male	22	35	17	22	4
Female	13	24	21	34	8
White	18	30	19	27	6
Black	10	23	29	34	3
Hispanics	19	24	18	35	5
18-29	15	33	20	25	8
30-39	18	34	18	28	2
40-49	15	27	22	30	6
50-64	13	24	23	34	7
65 and over	25	31	16	25	3
H.S. grad/less	14	24	19	33	9
Some college	20	31	20	25	4
College grad	17	34	21	27	2
Post grad	17	37	17	25	4
Democrat	18	29	19	29	5
Independent/other	19	33	17	24	7
Republican	15	30	20	30	5
Seattle	28	34	18	16	5
Baltimore	13	30	17	35	5
Chicago	20	28	21	26	6
San Antonio	13	25	22	33	7
Nashville	12	31	19	32	7

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 25

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: DON'T WORK WITH SOVIETS UNTIL THEY SHOW RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, EVEN IF THAT MEANS NO ARMS AGREEMENTS

We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights, even if that means not signing any arms control agreements	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	12	24	35	23	5
Male	11	25	39	22	3
Female	13	24	32	25	6
White	10	25	37	24	4
Black	13	23	34	23	8
Hispanics	26	27	27	15	5
18-29	9	29	34	22	5
30-39	12	27	32	25	5
40-49	9	23	42	23	3
50-64	16	20	37	26	1
65 and over	17	24	33	23	4
H.S. grad/less	15	26	33	20	5
Some college	11	24	38	23	4
College grad	7	23	38	30	3
Post grad	10	22	35	31	1
Democrat	11	25	34	26	4
Independent/other	12	24	34	28	2
Republican	13	26	38	20	4
Seattle	8	18	34	37	4
Baltimore	13	24	33	23	7
Chicago	12	25	35	23	6
San Antonio	16	25	45	12	3
Nashville	13	30	31	22	4

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 26

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE INCREASED AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES, EVEN IF IT INCREASES THE CHANCE OF U.S. TROOPS GETTING INVOLVED

We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries, even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	13	31	30	21	6
Male	16	31	29	21	3
Female	10	30	30	21	9
White	11	31	30	22	6
Black	14	31	32	20	4
Hispanics	27	27	25	15	5
18-29	11	29	32	21	7
30-39	14	36	29	18	3
40-49	10	36	31	19	5
50-64	12	28	27	29	5
65 and over	17	21	32	20	11
H.S. grad/less	15	27	30	20	8
Some college	13	28	35	19	5
College grad	7	36	26	27	4
Post grad	9	41	19	27	5
Democrat	11	25	32	26	6
Independent/other	8	24	32	29	7
Republican	16	38	28	14	5
Seattle	6	21	30	38	6
Baltimore	13	27	32	22	7
Chicago	12	31	28	23	6
San Antonio	19	34	33	9	5
Nashville	13	39	26	15	8

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 27

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH SOVIETS ON MANNED MISSION TO THE PLANET MARS, EVEN IF IT MEANS SHARING TECHNOLOGY

We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars, even if that means sharing our high technology	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	21	29	21	22	7
Male	27	29	20	19	6
Female	15	30	22	25	9
White	22	29	20	21	7
Black	14	39	23	20	4
Hispanics	16	31	19	29	4
18-29	18	29	20	24	9
30-39	18	32	19	25	6
40-49	21	29	20	22	7
50-64	23	28	19	23	7
65 and over	26	29	26	15	4
H.S. grad/less	17	21	30	25	8
Some college	24	34	16	20	6
College grad	22	36	15	22	6
Post grad	24	41	13	16	7
Democrat	23	32	22	19	5
Independent/other	30	25	23	13	9
Republican	16	30	19	28	8
Seattle	34	36	11	15	5
Baltimore	18	37	21	17	8
Chicago	23	21	20	24	11
San Antonio	14	26	26	30	5
Nashville	17	27	26	23	7

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 28

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MAKE ALLIES PAY MORE OF THE COST OF THEIR DEFENSE, EVEN IF WE LOSE SOME CONTROL OVER ECONOMIC ISSUES

We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense, even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	37	41	11	4	7
Male	43	42	9	3	3
Female	32	41	13	4	10
White	38	42	12	2	6
Black	26	42	13	7	12
Hispanics	31	49	9	9	3
18-29	26	44	16	5	9
30-39	38	41	13	2	6
40-49	37	45	10	2	6
50-64	40	42	6	6	5
65 and over	51	35	10	1	4
H.S. grad/less	31	41	13	5	10
Some college	38	41	12	3	5
College grad	37	49	9	1	5
Post grad	52	40	5	--	4
Democrat	34	42	13	5	6
Independent/other	34	42	12	4	9
Republican	42	42	9	1	5
Seattle	39	48	7	1	5
Baltimore	40	35	11	4	10
Chicago	37	36	14	6	7
San Antonio	36	44	11	3	5
Nashville	34	41	13	4	7

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 29

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS WITH SOVIETS TO PREVENT REGIONAL CRISES FROM ESCALATING, EVEN IF ALLIES OPPOSE THEM

We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war, even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	28	42	13	7	11
Male	35	42	10	6	7
Female	22	41	16	8	14
White	29	43	12	6	10
Black	19	45	15	8	12
Hispanics	21	32	25	17	5
18-29	22	45	13	5	16
30-39	24	45	15	8	9
40-49	24	47	13	8	8
50-64	35	37	11	7	9
65 and over	42	34	15	7	3
H.S. grad/less	20	42	15	10	14
Some college	33	40	15	6	8
College grad	32	44	9	6	10
Post grad	36	52	9	2	2
Democrat	28	41	14	7	9
Independent/other	31	42	10	3	14
Republican	28	44	13	7	8
Seattle	38	37	14	3	8
Baltimore	29	39	13	9	10
Chicago	30	40	13	6	11
San Antonio	19	44	18	10	9
Nashville	23	48	8	7	15

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 30

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: CUT BOTH SIDES NUCLEAR ARSENALS, EVEN IF THIS MEAN INCREASING OUR NONNUCLEAR FORCE TO MATCH THEIRS

We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals, even if that means increasing our nonnuclear conventional military strength (army, navy, etc) so it matches theirs	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	37	37	12	8	6
Male	40	37	12	7	3
Female	33	37	13	9	9
White	37	38	13	7	6
Black	29	36	18	11	7
Hispanics	39	32	10	18	2
18-29	34	43	10	7	6
30-39	44	34	11	8	3
40-49	29	37	17	12	5
50-64	30	40	16	6	8
65 and over	48	28	9	8	7
H.S. grad/less	32	37	12	10	9
Some college	40	36	11	8	4
College grad	35	40	14	6	5
Post grad	38	43	15	3	2
Democrat	39	36	11	8	5
Independent/other	29	40	15	9	8
Republican	38	36	14	8	5
Seattle	41	38	9	5	7
Baltimore	40	31	13	11	5
Chicago	34	39	13	7	7
San Antonio	35	37	13	9	5
Nashville	34	39	14	7	6

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 31

REACTIONS TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: STOP DEFENDING OTHER COUNTRIES AND DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA, EVEN IF WE MIGHT BE SURROUNDED BY ENEMIES

We should stop defending other countries around the world and only defend North America, even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	4	8	21	64	3
Male	4	7	18	68	3
Female	3	9	24	61	3
White	3	7	20	68	2
Black	7	9	36	44	4
Hispanics	3	10	16	67	3
18-29	3	11	19	65	2
30-39	2	8	19	69	3
40-49	3	5	22	67	2
50-64	3	6	22	67	2
65 and over	7	12	26	54	1
H.S. grad/less	5	10	27	56	3
Some college	4	8	19	68	2
College grad	3	9	13	75	1
Post grad	1	5	22	73	--
Democrat	5	9	24	60	2
Independent/other	3	8	23	63	3
Republican	2	7	16	74	2
Seattle	5	12	19	62	3
Baltimore	4	8	29	56	4
Chicago	3	7	22	65	3
San Antonio	3	7	20	69	2
Nashville	4	8	17	69	3

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 32

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIETS ARE CONSTANTLY TESTING FOR WEAKNESS, AND TAKE ADVANTAGE WHEN THEY FIND IT

The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	71	16	13
Male	72	16	12
Female	71	16	13
White	71	17	12
Black	68	14	19
Hispanic	81	12	7
18-29	63	22	15
30-39	63	23	14
40-49	75	16	9
50-64	80	9	11
65 and over	82	10	8
H.S. grad/less	76	15	10
Some college	71	17	12
College grad	65	21	14
Post grad	69	17	14
Democrat	68	19	12
Independent/other	71	19	9
Republican	75	12	13
Seattle	56	27	17
Baltimore	65	15	20
Chicago	72	16	12
San Antonio	84	9	7
Nashville	78	14	8

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 33

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: WE SHOULD LIVE AND LET LIVE

We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	49	37	14
Male	53	37	11
Female	46	38	16
White	49	38	13
Black	60	29	11
Hispanic	32	54	15
18-29	53	36	11
30-39	51	38	11
40-49	43	44	13
50-64	50	35	16
65 and over	51	33	16
H.S. grad/less	44	40	16
Some college	50	39	11
College grad	53	34	13
Post grad	58	28	14
Democrat	58	30	13
Independent/other	54	34	12
Republican	38	47	15
Seattle	68	20	12
Baltimore	50	33	18
Chicago	56	37	12
San Antonio	33	54	13
Nashville	45	42	13

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 34

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE SOVIET UNION IS LIKE HITLER'S GERMANY -- AN EVIL EMPIRE

The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	42	39	19
Male	41	45	15
Female	43	34	22
White	42	41	18
Black	34	46	20
Hispanic	57	19	24
18-29	30	52	18
30-39	43	43	14
40-49	42	36	21
50-64	49	28	23
65 and over	53	32	15
H.S. grad/less	51	31	18
Some college	41	39	20
College grad/more	29	52	19
Post grad	29	59	13
Democrat	37	43	20
Independent/other	40	43	16
Republican	49	34	17
Seattle	25	60	16
Baltimore	40	39	21
Chicago	42	37	21
San Antonio	57	24	19
Nashville	46	38	16

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 35

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: BECAUSE THE SOVIETS WON'T KEEP THEIR END OF THE BARGIN, WE SHOULD NOT SIGN ANY ARMS AGREEMENTS WITH THEM

Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	24	61	15
Male	18	71	11
Female	29	52	19
White	21	66	14
Black	34	45	21
Hispanic	42	47	12
18-29	27	60	13
30-39	23	65	12
40-49	22	61	17
50-64	25	57	19
65 and over	20	71	9
H.S. grad/less	33	49	19
Some college	20	66	14
College grad	11	80	9
Post grad	19	70	11
Democrat	23	61	16
Independent/other	20	68	12
Republican	24	64	13
Seattle	9	79	12
Baltimore	29	57	14
Chicago	24	61	15
San Antonio	32	51	17
Nashville	25	59	16

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 36

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: THE U.S. WOULD BE SAFER IF WE STOPPED TRYING TO STOP COMMUNISM AND LEARNED TO LIVE WITH THEM

The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	41	43	17
Male	40	45	15
Female	42	40	18
White	42	42	16
Black	35	44	21
Hispanic	35	51	13
18-29	42	41	16
30-39	46	42	12
40-49	37	44	20
50-64	38	42	20
65 and over	44	45	12
H.S. grad/less	37	44	19
Some college	41	41	18
College grad	43	46	11
Post grad	50	42	8
Democrat	48	36	16
Independent/other	45	33	22
Republican	31	55	14
Seattle	60	26	14
Baltimore	45	35	20
Chicago	36	49	16
San Antonio	26	59	15
Nashville	38	44	19

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 37

AGREEMENT WITH SPECIFIC STATEMENTS: WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE, SOMEDAY WE'LL HAVE TO FIGHT THE SOVIET UNION TO STOP COMMUNISM

When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	23	48	29
Male	21	56	24
Female	26	41	33
White	20	52	29
Black	26	39	35
Hispanic	48	28	24
18-29	26	48	27
30-39	24	50	26
40-49	23	45	32
50-64	25	50	24
65 and over	15	52	33
H.S. grad/less	30	40	30
Some college	21	49	30
College grad	18	61	21
Post grad	9	63	29
Democrat	20	54	26
Independent/other	22	53	24
Republican	25	44	31
Seattle	10	69	22
Baltimore	26	51	23
Chicago	19	48	32
San Antonio	42	30	29
Nashville	21	43	36

"Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 38

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: SHOULD AN AMERICAN AUTO COMPANY MAKE CARS IN RUSSIA TO SELL ON THE WORLD MARKET

Should an American auto company make cars in the Soviet Union to sell on the world market which will help us compete with the Japanese but also benefit the Soviets	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
	%	%	%
Total	38	43	19
Male	46	41	13
Female	31	45	25
White	40	42	18
Black	32	50	17
Hispanic	24	47	30
18-29	43	33	24
30-39	41	42	17
40-49	40	39	20
50-64	33	55	13
65 and over	31	54	15
H.S. grad/less	26	52	22
Some college	42	40	18
College grad	47	36	17
Post grad	58	30	12
Democrat	39	41	21
Independent/other	51	33	16
Republican	34	51	15
Seattle	62	21	17
Baltimore	32	46	22
Chicago	31	49	20
San Antonio	28	55	17
Nashville	37	44	19

"How do you feel about the following? A major American auto company is considering a joint venture to make cars in the Soviet Union. Those in favor say this would help an American company compete with the Japanese in the world market. But those opposed say this kind of arrangement would make the Soviets stronger and thus more of a threat in the long run. How do you feel? Do you favor or oppose an American company making cars in the Soviet Union to sell on the world market?"

TABLE 39

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND WE ARE WEALTHIER AND OUR TECHNOLOGY IS BETTER

We can gain the upper hand because we are wealthier and have higher technology	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	43	50	7
Male	43	52	6
Female	43	48	9
White	41	52	7
Black	50	43	7
Hispanic	50	41	9
18-29	44	50	6
30-39	42	52	5
40-49	44	48	8
50-64	41	50	9
65 and over	42	52	6
H.S. grad/less	50	41	9
Some college	39	55	6
College grad	39	57	4
Post grad	33	62	6
Democrat	41	51	8
Independent/other	33	61	6
Republican	47	48	5
Seattle	30	65	5
Baltimore	40	50	10
Chicago	50	44	6
San Antonio	45	47	8
Nashville	51	41	8

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 40

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND GRENADA PROVES WE CAN AND SHOULD TRY TO STOP COMMUNIST EXPANSION

The success of the Grenada invasion proves that we can and should try to stop communist expansion	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	40	46	14
Male	41	52	7
Female	38	42	20
White	39	48	13
Black	33	51	17
Hispanic	58	31	12
18-29	39	47	14
30-39	39	50	11
40-49	37	50	13
50-64	42	45	13
65 and over	44	44	13
H.S. grad/less	46	37	17
Some college	40	47	14
College grad	27	66	7
Post grad	38	58	5
Democrat	34	53	13
Independent/other	33	50	17
Republican	48	39	12
Seattle	24	66	10
Baltimore	36	48	16
Chicago	47	38	15
San Antonio	51	38	11
Nashville	40	42	18

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 41

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
THE U.S. HAS AN OBLIGATION TO DEFEND FREEDOM AND OPPOSE COMMUNISM

The U.S. has an obligation to oppose Soviet and communist expansion and defend freedom around the world	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	55	33	12
Male	55	32	13
Female	55	34	12
White	56	32	12
Black	48	40	12
Hispanic	63	23	13
18-29	49	33	18
30-39	63	28	9
40-49	57	34	10
50-64	51	36	14
65 and over	58	34	8
H.S. grad/less	60	27	13
Some college	56	32	12
College grad	51	41	8
Post grad	46	38	17
Democrat	55	35	11
Independent/other	43	41	17
Republican	62	27	12
Seattle	39	52	9
Baltimore	51	32	17
Chicago	58	29	13
San Antonio	65	23	12
Nashville	62	27	11

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 42

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND WE ARE ALREADY IN A WINNER-TAKE-ALL COMPETITION WITH THE SOVIETS

We are already in a winner-take-all competition with the Soviets and, realistically speaking, this is the only way to keep them at bay	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	30	55	15
Male	28	60	12
Female	32	50	18
White	28	59	14
Black	39	45	17
Hispanic	50	33	17
18-29	29	53	18
30-39	32	56	13
40-49	34	54	13
50-64	27	59	13
65 and over	29	56	15
H.S. grad/less	34	47	19
Some college	31	55	13
College grad	22	70	8
Post grad	29	64	6
Democrat	31	53	16
Independent/other	19	67	14
Republican	34	54	12
Seattle	15	73	13
Baltimore	32	51	17
Chicago	31	52	17
San Antonio	40	47	13
Nashville	33	52	15

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 43

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
THIS IS THE FORMULA FOR AN ENDLESS ARMS RACE

Trying to gain military superiority is a formula for an endless arms race	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	75	19	6
Male	79	17	4
Female	72	20	8
White	78	17	6
Black	70	24	7
Hispanic	66	31	3
18-29	78	18	5
30-39	80	16	4
40-49	72	21	8
50-64	68	22	10
65 and over	81	18	2
H.S. grad/less	67	24	9
Some college	77	18	5
College grad	85	13	2
Post grad	85	13	3
Democrat	75	19	7
Independent/other	83	10	7
Republican	75	22	3
Seattle	88	7	4
Baltimore	75	21	4
Chicago	70	22	8
San Antonio	71	24	6
Nashville	72	19	10

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 44

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND TRYING TO STOP COMMUNIST EXPANSION WILL LEAD TO ANOTHER VIETNAM

Trying to stop communist expansion around the world will only lead us into more Vietnams	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	49	38	14
Male	48	42	11
Female	50	34	16
White	49	39	13
Black	56	33	12
Hispanic	45	44	11
18-29	49	35	15
30-39	55	35	10
40-49	51	36	14
50-64	40	44	16
65 and over	50	41	9
H.S. grad/less	49	33	18
Some college	47	42	11
College grad/more	52	40	8
Post grad	52	40	8
Democrat	56	31	13
Independent/other	48	35	17
Republican	41	47	12
Seattle	62	27	12
Baltimore	53	34	14
Chicago	41	42	17
San Antonio	36	49	15
Nashville	51	39	11

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 45

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND THIS FUTURE WOULD BE TOO EXPENSIVE

This future would be too expensive because it would mean enormous defense spending, year after year	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	70	21	8
Male	72	23	5
Female	69	20	11
White	70	23	8
Black	73	22	5
Hispanic	69	20	10
18-29	77	16	7
30-39	75	22	4
40-49	64	25	11
50-64	70	21	9
65 and over	64	29	7
H.S. grad/less	63	23	14
Some college	70	24	6
College grad/more	79	20	1
Post grad	85	12	3
Democrat	75	19	6
Independent/other	67	25	8
Republican	67	25	9
Seattle	79	16	5
Baltimore	72	20	9
Chicago	71	20	10
San Antonio	68	23	9
Nashville	62	30	8

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 46

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND
THIS FUTURE WOULD BE TOO DANGEROUS

This future would be too dangerous because the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	48	37	15
Male	48	38	14
Female	48	36	16
White	49	37	14
Black	49	33	18
Hispanic	44	41	14
18-29	55	30	15
30-39	52	35	13
40-49	50	40	10
50-64	38	46	16
65 and over	45	38	17
H.S. grad/less	47	35	18
Some college	48	37	15
College grad	54	39	7
Post grad	50	44	7
Democrat	54	31	15
Independent/other	47	39	15
Republican	43	44	14
Seattle	59	27	14
Baltimore	45	37	19
Chicago	45	36	19
San Antonio	40	49	12
Nashville	54	35	11

"Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 47

OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future One	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	26	23	17	24	10
Male	26	22	17	25	10
Female	27	23	17	23	10
White	24	23	18	26	10
Black	30	26	13	23	9
Hispanics	45	22	13	11	9
18-29	19	23	18	29	11
30-39	23	20	17	31	9
40-49	29	24	16	23	8
50-64	28	20	20	21	11
65 and over	35	29	13	16	8
H.S. grad/less	31	22	17	14	16
Some college	25	24	16	27	9
College grad	20	24	18	35	4
Post grad	19	24	17	38	2
Democrat	25	20	17	28	9
Independent/other	17	21	15	36	11
Republican	30	27	17	17	9
Seattle	18	18	17	43	4
Baltimore	28	24	17	21	10
Chicago	26	24	18	20	12
San Antonio	35	26	18	13	9
Nashville	26	23	15	22	15

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand. Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.

PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.
CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they are backed into a corner."

TABLE 48

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT SO THE WORLD WON'T BE DESTROYED

We should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow they are ever used, the whole world won't be destroyed	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	75	22	4
Male	78	21	2
Female	72	23	5
White	77	21	3
Black	67	27	7
Hispanic	68	30	2
18-29	77	21	3
30-39	74	24	3
40-49	66	32	3
50-64	75	20	6
65 and over	86	14	1
H.S. grad/less	73	23	5
Some college	75	22	3
College grad	78	22	--
Post grad	78	21	1
Democrat	75	22	2
Independent/other	72	23	5
Republican	75	23	2
Seattle	83	15	3
Baltimore	68	25	7
Chicago	79	17	4
San Antonio	70	28	2
Nashville	73	25	2

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 49

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT
WE'LL KNOW IF THEY CHEAT

Under their new leader, the Soviets will allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	47	41	12
Male	53	36	11
Female	42	45	13
White	48	41	12
Black	43	46	10
Hispanic	48	46	6
18-29	44	40	17
30-39	48	41	11
40-49	48	44	8
50-64	48	43	10
65 and over	52	38	11
H.S. grad/less	44	45	11
Some college	52	37	11
College grad	44	45	11
Post grad	47	40	14
Democrat	47	39	14
Independent/other	52	38	10
Republican	46	45	9
Seattle	54	33	13
Baltimore	47	37	16
Chicago	46	37	17
San Antonio	42	52	6
Nashville	45	46	9

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 50

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT REACH AN AGREEMENT TO PREVENT LOCAL CONFLICTS FROM ESCALATING

We and the Soviets should reach agreements to prevent local conflicts, such as in the Middle East, from escalating because they are the major way that a nuclear war could start	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	75	17	8
Male	79	15	6
Female	70	20	10
White	76	15	9
Black	71	26	3
Hispanic	66	28	6
18-29	76	17	7
30-39	77	18	5
40-49	71	21	9
50-64	71	19	11
65 and over	83	9	8
H.S. grad/less	68	19	14
Some college	78	16	6
College grad	82	15	3
Post grad	76	21	3
Democrat	77	16	7
Independent/other	76	17	8
Republican	75	18	8
Seattle	83	11	6
Baltimore	72	20	8
Chicago	74	15	11
San Antonio	68	23	9
Nashville	76	17	7

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 51

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT LESS RISK IN OUR OPPOSING THIRD WORLD COMMUNIST EXPANSION

Eliminating the nuclear threat will enable us to oppose communist expansion in the Third World with less risk	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	42	42	16
Male	46	44	11
Female	38	41	21
White	40	44	16
Black	45	38	17
Hispanic	53	33	15
18-29	43	35	22
30-39	46	45	9
40-49	39	48	13
50-64	41	44	15
65 and over	41	42	17
H.S. grad/less	39	40	22
Some college	45	42	14
College grad	42	47	12
Post grad	42	46	12
Democrat	42	43	16
Independent/other	38	45	17
Republican	43	42	15
Seattle	39	46	14
Baltimore	37	43	20
Chicago	50	34	16
San Antonio	37	47	16
Nashville	46	40	15

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 52

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT
THE SOVIETS WILL CHEAT

The Soviets can't be trusted and will cheat on arms control treaties	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	47	37	16
Male	43	42	14
Female	51	32	17
White	47	37	17
Black	42	42	17
Hispanic	64	31	6
18-29	41	40	19
30-39	46	40	14
40-49	48	40	13
50-64	52	30	18
65 and over	53	35	13
H.S. grad/less	52	32	15
Some college	50	34	16
College grad	35	51	14
Post grad	36	46	18
Democrat	44	40	16
Independent/other	39	46	15
Republican	53	31	16
Seattle	25	59	16
Baltimore	48	33	19
Chicago	45	39	16
San Antonio	63	26	11
Nashville	57	26	17

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 53

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT
NUCLEAR WEAPONS HAVE KEPT THE PEACE SINCE WWII

We should not reach agreements to end the arms race because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since WWII	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	31	57	12
Male	28	63	9
Female	34	51	15
White	31	58	12
Black	34	49	17
Hispanic	34	55	12
18-29	33	51	16
30-39	31	59	10
40-49	34	58	8
50-64	30	56	14
65 and over	27	65	8
H.S. grad/less	37	47	16
Some college	29	60	11
College grad	26	66	8
Post grad	28	69	4
Democrat	30	57	13
Independent/other	30	61	10
Republican	32	57	11
Seattle	23	69	8
Baltimore	32	51	17
Chicago	29	59	12
San Antonio	36	55	9
Nashville	38	49	13

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 54

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT WOULD LEAVE THE SOVIETS WITH AN ADVANTAGE IN CONVENTIONAL FORCES

This Future would leave the Soviets with a large advantage in nonnuclear (conventional) forces such as tanks and soldiers	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	53	33	14
Male	55	36	9
Female	51	31	19
White	56	32	12
Black	41	38	22
Hispanic	42	42	16
18-29	53	31	16
30-39	58	30	13
40-49	47	42	11
50-64	57	31	12
65 and over	55	31	14
H.S. grad/less	49	33	18
Some college	53	34	13
College grad/more	58	35	7
Post grad	61	31	8
Democrat	48	38	14
Independent/other	53	35	12
Republican	63	26	12
Seattle	52	35	13
Baltimore	45	34	21
Chicago	54	34	12
San Antonio	57	31	12
Nashville	57	31	12

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 55

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT NOT REALISTIC TO COMPETE IN THIRD WORLD AND COOPERATE ON NUCLEAR REDUCTION

It's just not realistic to think that we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while, at the same time, cooperate with them to eliminate the risk of nuclear war	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	38	45	17
Male	32	52	16
Female	44	38	18
White	37	46	18
Black	45	34	21
Hispanic	53	36	11
18-29	45	35	20
30-39	39	45	16
40-49	41	45	14
50-64	34	46	21
65 and over	33	57	10
High school graduate	41	37	21
Some college	40	45	16
College grad	36	51	13
Post grad	30	57	13
Democrat	42	41	17
Independent/other	37	54	9
Republican	36	47	18
Seattle	32	55	13
Baltimore	34	43	23
Chicago	38	45	18
San Antonio	42	44	14
Nashville	46	37	18

"Here are some arguments for Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world. Indicate whether you think each argument if convincing or not."

TABLE 56

OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE

Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future Two	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	21	34	21	13	11
Male	24	38	18	10	10
Female	18	30	24	16	12
White	21	34	23	13	10
Black	21	35	20	11	12
Hispanics	32	27	13	16	11
18-29	17	33	26	13	11
30-39	24	39	17	15	5
40-49	18	31	28	13	10
50-64	16	40	18	12	15
65 and over	35	24	17	13	12
H.S. grad/less	21	28	22	14	15
Some college	24	31	22	11	11
College grad	15	47	24	12	2
Post grad	23	43	16	12	6
Democrat	21	31	21	15	12
Independent/other	19	36	26	9	11
Republican	22	36	21	13	8
Seattle	22	38	17	16	7
Baltimore	20	37	23	10	11
Chicago	23	29	22	12	14
San Antonio	23	34	20	14	10
Nashville	17	31	25	13	14

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat: Compete Otherwise. Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.

PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before a nuclear war.
CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements."

TABLE 57

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING NUCLEAR WEAPONS, POLLUTION, AND AIDS ARE THE REAL PROBLEMS FACING US BOTH

The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and AID are the real problems facing us and the Soviets	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	83	14	3
Male	84	14	3
Female	83	13	4
White	84	14	3
Black	87	9	4
Hispanic	78	19	3
18-29	86	11	3
30-39	84	14	3
40-49	83	14	3
50-64	84	15	1
65 and over	83	13	4
H.S. grad/less	84	11	5
Some college	83	14	2
College grad	86	12	2
Post grad	81	19	--
Democrat	88	11	2
Independent/other	82	14	4
Republican	81	16	3
Seattle	89	10	1
Baltimore	87	9	5
Chicago	82	14	4
San Antonio	71	24	5
Nashville	87	12	1

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 58

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
A BASIC CHANGE TO PRODUCE TRUST IS THE ONLY WAY TO END THE ARMS RACE

A basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	73	20	7
Male	73	21	6
Female	73	19	7
White	73	20	7
Black	76	19	5
Hispanic	65	30	5
18-29	72	22	7
30-39	66	25	9
40-49	74	22	4
50-64	76	17	8
65 and over	81	16	3
H.S. grad/less	69	22	8
Some college	77	19	4
College grad	78	18	4
Post grad	65	26	10
Democrat	80	16	4
Independent/other	77	18	5
Republican	65	27	9
Seattle	79	16	5
Baltimore	75	21	4
Chicago	73	16	12
San Antonio	64	29	7
Nashville	75	20	6

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 59

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
THE SOVIETS SEEM WILLING TO GO DOWN THIS PATH

The Soviets seem willing to go down this path	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	40	38	23
Male	43	36	21
Female	36	39	25
White	41	38	22
Black	34	37	29
Hispanic	34	40	27
18-29	36	35	29
30-39	45	44	10
40-49	40	36	24
50-64	37	41	22
65 and over	44	30	26
H.S. grad/less	36	38	26
Some college	41	37	22
College grad/more	45	35	20
Post grad	40	43	17
Democrat	43	32	26
Independent/other	50	29	21
Republican	34	47	20
Seattle	56	28	16
Baltimore	36	38	26
Chicago	38	30	32
San Antonio	29	50	21
Nashville	39	42	20

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 60

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
WE MUST CHANGE OUR BASIC RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIETS IN ORDER TO BE SAFE

Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	73	18	10
Male	71	20	9
Female	74	15	10
White	72	19	9
Black	79	11	10
Hispanic	68	17	16
18-29	72	18	10
30-39	77	13	10
40-49	74	20	6
50-64	69	20	11
65 and over	73	19	9
H.S. grad/less	65	23	12
Some college	76	14	11
College grad/more	83	15	2
Post grad	76	18	6
Democrat	77	13	10
Independent/other	79	12	9
Republican	66	26	8
Seattle	79	13	8
Baltimore	72	16	13
Chicago	72	16	12
San Antonio	70	21	9
Nashville	71	22	8

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 61

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING MEANS GIVING UP THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNIST EXPANSION

This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	26	59	15
Male	28	62	10
Female	24	56	20
White	27	59	14
Black	24	60	16
Hispanic	28	59	13
18-29	30	52	18
30-39	29	59	12
40-49	25	63	12
50-64	26	53	21
65 and over	21	73	6
H.S. grad/less	26	53	22
Some college	29	61	11
College grad/more	23	70	8
Post grad	29	62	9
Democrat	22	65	13
Independent/other	21	63	17
Republican	35	51	14
Seattle	18	71	11
Baltimore	18	63	19
Chicago	32	54	15
San Antonio	36	49	15
Nashville	28	58	15

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 62

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
WE WOULD HAVE TO SHARE OUR HIGH TECHNOLOGY

This Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	43	48	9
Male	43	50	7
Female	43	46	12
White	44	48	8
Black	36	51	13
Hispanic	38	54	8
18-29	50	44	7
30-39	47	46	7
40-49	36	53	11
50-64	42	46	11
65 and over	37	55	8
H.S. grad/less	43	49	8
Some college	42	48	9
College grad	45	44	11
Post grad	41	55	4
Democrat	39	50	11
Independent/other	37	58	6
Republican	51	43	7
Seattle	33	58	9
Baltimore	34	52	15
Chicago	52	40	8
San Antonio	50	42	8
Nashville	45	49	7

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 63

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING MEANS GIVING UP OR SHARING SDI

This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI and giving up the idea of gaining clear military superiority.	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	42	45	13
Male	44	47	10
Female	41	44	15
White	42	47	12
Black	34	44	22
Hispanic	57	35	9
18-29	43	43	13
30-39	47	45	9
40-49	46	43	11
50-64	35	52	14
65 and over	40	47	13
H.S. grad/less	40	45	15
Some college	43	45	12
College grad	46	48	7
Post grad	46	47	7
Democrat	39	48	13
Independent/other	39	48	14
Republican	49	41	10
Seattle	35	55	9
Baltimore	32	49	19
Chicago	49	38	14
San Antonio	49	40	12
Nashville	45	45	10

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 64

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING THE SOVIETS WILL TRICK US AND TURN ON US

The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, and then turn on us as they have in the past	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	42	39	19
Male	38	44	18
Female	46	35	19
White	42	41	17
Black	34	40	25
Hispanic	60	22	19
18-29	39	41	20
30-39	45	43	12
40-49	39	39	22
50-64	46	37	18
65 and over	48	37	16
H.S. grad/less	52	31	18
Some college	42	39	19
College grad	27	56	18
Post grad	30	51	19
Democrat	37	42	21
Independent/other	37	47	17
Republican	50	34	15
Seattle	25	58	17
Baltimore	38	38	24
Chicago	37	44	19
San Antonio	60	27	14
Nashville	52	29	19

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 65

OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future Three	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	39	31	13	8	9
Male	39	34	12	7	8
Female	39	28	14	10	10
White	40	30	13	9	8
Black	35	34	19	4	9
Hispanics	35	31	11	12	11
18-29	35	33	13	8	11
30-39	39	34	14	10	4
40-49	41	30	13	11	6
50-64	36	28	15	7	15
65 and over	53	27	7	6	8
H.S. grad/less	35	27	13	11	15
Some college	45	31	13	5	6
College grad	38	38	12	7	4
Post grad	39	31	13	14	3
Democrat	44	30	11	6	10
Independent/other	40	34	12	7	7
Republican	35	31	16	12	6
Seattle	54	27	8	6	6
Baltimore	43	31	14	5	7
Chicago	36	31	13	7	13
San Antonio	28	31	16	15	11
Nashville	34	34	14	9	9

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us."

TABLE 66

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
OUR ALLIES CAN DEFEND THEMSELVES

Our allies are perfectly capable of defending themselves and can afford it	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	33	59	9
Male	34	60	6
Female	32	57	11
White	32	60	8
Black	37	50	12
Hispanic	28	65	8
18-29	39	53	8
30-39	32	60	8
40-49	27	68	5
50-64	29	60	12
65 and over	34	57	9
H.S. grad/less	37	53	11
Some college	29	63	9
College grad	28	68	4
Post grad	37	58	6
Democrat	34	57	9
Independent/other	38	49	14
Republican	27	67	6
Seattle	39	51	11
Baltimore	30	59	12
Chicago	31	61	8
San Antonio	31	64	5
Nashville	35	58	7

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 67

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
WE CAN'T AFFORD TO DEFEND SO MANY NATIONS

Especially in view of our problems here in the U.S., we can't afford to defend so many nations	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	55	38	6
Male	51	43	6
Female	59	34	7
White	54	39	7
Black	59	34	7
Hispanic	56	41	3
18-29	60	33	7
30-39	54	41	5
40-49	50	45	5
50-64	52	39	10
65 and over	58	38	4
H.S. grad/less	55	39	6
Some college	53	41	6
College grad	49	44	7
Post grad	68	25	7
Democrat	59	33	7
Independent/other	57	36	6
Republican	48	47	5
Seattle	62	32	7
Baltimore	54	39	7
Chicago	52	42	7
San Antonio	54	43	3
Nashville	55	37	9

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 68

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
BEING "POLICEMAN" INCREASES THE CHANCES OF NUCLEAR WAR

Being the "world's policeman" increases our chances of getting dragged into a nuclear war	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	58	34	8
Male	55	39	7
Female	62	30	8
White	57	37	7
Black	65	22	13
Hispanic	61	34	5
18-29	62	31	8
30-39	52	41	8
40-49	57	38	5
50-64	55	37	9
65 and over	65	29	6
H.S. grad/less	62	27	10
Some college	56	40	5
College grad/more	50	44	6
Post grad	63	31	7
Democrat	65	27	8
Independent/other	58	36	6
Republican	51	43	6
Seattle	61	34	5
Baltimore	57	33	10
Chicago	59	31	11
San Antonio	56	39	5
Nashville	58	35	6

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 69

ARGUMENTS FOR FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA COUNTRIES WE PROTECT ARE BEATING US ECONOMICALLY

While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	79	16	5
Male	80	16	4
Female	78	16	7
White	80	16	4
Black	71	20	9
Hispanic	74	19	7
18-29	74	19	7
30-39	77	20	3
40-49	78	17	5
50-64	83	11	5
65 and over	85	13	3
H.S. grad/less	75	17	8
Some college	82	15	3
College grad	77	20	3
Post grad	80	16	5
Democrat	81	14	5
Independent/other	75	21	4
Republican	79	17	5
Seattle	80	13	7
Baltimore	72	19	9
Chicago	82	15	4
San Antonio	79	18	3
Nashville	81	16	4

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 70

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA EVENTUALLY THE WORLD MAY BE FILLED WITH ENEMIES

Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and eventually leave us alone in a world filled with enemies	Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
	%	%	%
Total	55	34	12
Male	55	37	8
Female	54	31	15
White	57	33	11
Black	50	36	15
Hispanic	48	42	10
18-29	63	26	12
30-39	62	32	7
40-49	51	40	9
50-64	46	35	19
65 and over	49	40	11
H.S. grad/less	52	33	15
Some college	55	35	10
College grad	62	31	7
Post grad	52	37	10
Democrat	50	35	15
Independent/other	51	39	10
Republican	62	29	9
Seattle	51	40	9
Baltimore	51	32	17
Chicago	55	33	12
San Antonio	57	34	9
Nashville	61	29	10

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 71

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
WE HAVE A MORAL OBLIGATION TO DEFEND FREEDOM

We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	54	36	11
Male	54	35	11
Female	53	36	11
White	54	37	10
Black	50	37	13
Hispanic	63	27	11
18-29	55	34	11
30-39	67	27	6
40-49	54	36	9
50-64	41	46	12
65 and over	49	39	13
H.S. grad/less	57	33	11
Some college	53	37	10
College grad	49	44	7
Post grad	54	35	11
Democrat	51	38	12
Independent/other	41	50	9
Republican	63	28	9
Seattle	36	52	12
Baltimore	51	33	17
Chicago	54	37	9
San Antonio	63	29	8
Nashville	64	29	8

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 72

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA IT IS U.S. STRENGTH THAT KEEPS RUTHLESS COUNTRIES FROM STARTING TROUBLE

History shows that it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless, aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world	Convincing Argument %	Not Convincing %	Not Sure %
Total	61	28	11
Male	59	30	11
Female	63	26	11
White	61	28	11
Black	48	38	14
Hispanic	74	21	5
18-29	62	26	12
30-39	67	23	10
40-49	57	34	10
50-64	57	31	12
65 and over	63	31	6
H.S. grad/less	65	23	11
Some college	61	27	12
College grad/more	55	35	9
Post grad	50	42	7
Democrat	58	31	11
Independent/other	51	35	13
Republican	68	24	9
Seattle	49	44	7
Baltimore	54	28	18
Chicago	61	26	13
San Antonio	71	22	6
Nashville	69	20	11

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 73

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA
OTHER NATIONS WILL FEEL INSECURE AND BUILD NUCLEAR WEAPONS

If we pull back, many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons	Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
	%	%	%
Total	66	22	13
Male	66	21	12
Female	65	22	13
White	66	21	13
Black	64	24	12
Hispanic	64	31	5
18-29	71	16	14
30-39	69	24	7
40-49	63	22	16
50-64	63	25	13
65 and over	59	30	11
H.S. grad/less	64	21	15
Some college	65	23	13
College grad	68	22	9
Post grad	67	23	10
Democrat	65	22	13
Independent/other	60	26	14
Republican	69	21	10
Seattle	56	30	15
Baltimore	69	18	14
Chicago	68	21	14
San Antonio	70	22	8
Nashville	68	19	13

"Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not."

TABLE 74

OVERALL REACTION TO FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about Future Four	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	14	15	23	42	7
Male	15	15	19	46	5
Female	13	15	26	38	8
White	12	13	23	46	7
Black	20	27	22	25	7
Hispanics	21	9	30	37	3
18-29	12	15	28	40	5
30-39	12	18	18	50	4
40-49	11	13	25	46	6
50-64	12	17	23	40	8
65 and over	23	10	21	35	10
H.S. grad/less	19	17	23	33	8
Some college	12	13	20	50	6
College grad/more	6	14	26	50	3
Post grad	8	13	29	43	7
Democrat	16	15	24	38	7
Independent/other	9	18	30	37	7
Republican	12	12	20	51	5
Seattle	11	19	22	43	6
Baltimore	17	16	29	33	5
Chicago	19	14	21	38	8
San Antonio	14	10	25	48	4
Nashville	10	15	18	47	10

"Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North American. Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.

PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.
CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world."

TABLE 75

OVERALL VIEW OF THE FOUR FUTURES: FUTURES RANKED FIRST OR SECOND IN PREFERENCE

Futures ranked first or second in preference	FUTURE ONE %	FUTURE TWO %	FUTURE THREE %	FUTURE FOUR %
Total	39	75	76	12
Male	37	77	76	12
Female	41	72	77	12
White	39	76	76	11
Black	34	65	87	19
Hispanic	55	72	70	6
18-29	35	71	79	16
30-39	36	78	79	10
40-49	38	73	80	13
50-64	48	79	68	9
65 and over	42	76	73	13
Less than high school	47	70	72	16
High school graduate	37	73	81	11
Some college	30	84	79	7
College grad/more	37	88	76	8
Democrat	36	75	79	13
Independent/other	31	75	85	12
Republican	46	76	71	10
Seattle	20	78	90	13
Baltimore	35	71	84	13
Chicago	43	79	72	10
San Antonio	56	76	62	9
Nashville	44	69	74	16

"Rank the four Futures in the order you favor them. Rank them by giving a "1" to the Future you favor most, a "2" to your second choice, a "3" to your third choice, and a "4" to the Future you favor least."

TABLE 76

OVERALL VIEW OF THE FOUR FUTURES: FUTURES NOT SELECTED BECAUSE THEY ARE BELIEVED NOT POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE

Is there any Future you favor but did not select because you think it's not possible to achieve?	FUTURE ONE %	FUTURE TWO %	FUTURE THREE %	FUTURE FOUR %	All are Possible %
Total	16	18	25	13	35
Male	19	16	23	13	36
Female	12	19	28	14	34
White	14	18	25	13	37
Black	17	14	32	14	29
Hispanics	26	15	24	7	29
18-29	17	20	21	7	38
30-39	7	16	30	16	36
40-49	14	11	24	16	39
50-64	22	20	30	16	24
65 and over	20	20	22	13	33
H.S. grad/less	21	17	24	15	31
Some college	13	19	27	13	35
College grad	9	20	24	10	42
Post grad	15	12	29	9	40
Democrat	16	15	22	13	38
Independent/other	11	11	26	12	44
Republican	17	23	30	13	26
Seattle	8	15	22	8	53
Baltimore	19	16	31	16	29
Chicago	15	17	28	15	32
San Antonio	21	25	21	9	29
Nashville	15	16	24	18	33

TABLE 77

OVERALL VIEW OF THE FOUR FUTURES: WHICH FUTURE IS MOST LIKELY TO OCCUR BY 2010, REGARDLESS OF PREFERENCE

Regardless of which Future you prefer, which one do you think is most likely to occur by the year 2010	FUTURE ONE %	FUTURE TWO %	FUTURE THREE %	FUTURE FOUR %	Not Sure %
Total	22	31	31	3	14
Male	22	33	31	4	9
Female	21	29	30	3	18
White	20	32	32	3	14
Black	19	22	36	5	18
Hispanics	37	34	19	--	10
18-29	22	30	30	3	15
30-39	25	34	26	1	15
40-49	24	30	37	2	8
50-64	18	35	28	6	14
65 and over	19	27	36	5	14
H.S. grad/less	21	25	32	6	16
Some college	23	31	34	1	12
College grad	17	40	30	3	11
Post grad	24	38	23	4	12
Democrat	20	25	39	4	12
Independent/other	16	39	26	1	19
Republican	24	34	25	3	14
Seattle	16	38	34	5	8
Baltimore	20	20	40	4	17
Chicago	21	35	25	4	14
San Antonio	27	32	25	1	15
Nashville	24	30	29	3	15

TABLE 78

EVALUATION OF INFORMATION PRESENTED IN LABS: MORE OR LESS THOUGHT-PROVOKING THAN TV OR NEWSPAPER NEWS

How would you compare the information tonight to information from TV news. Was is more thought-provoking, less, or the same as TV or newspaper news	More than TV %	Less than TV %	Same as TV %	Not Sure %
Total	76	4	16	4
Male	73	5	17	5
Female	79	2	15	4
White	79	3	15	4
Black	64	8	19	9
Hispanic	68	4	26	3
18-29	75	6	15	4
30-39	72	5	20	4
40-49	75	3	18	4
50-64	80	2	12	6
65 and over	83	2	13	1
H.S. grad/less	75	5	13	7
Some college	77	3	17	3
College grad	75	5	20	1
Post grad	82	2	14	2
Democrat	74	4	18	5
Independent/other	80	3	16	2
Republican	79	4	13	3
Seattle	78	3	16	3
Baltimore	71	4	17	7
Chicago	75	6	16	3
San Antonio	77	2	18	4
Nashville	79	3	14	5

"How would you compare the presentation tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more thought-provoking, less thought-provoking, or about the same?"

TABLE 79

EVALUATION OF INFORMATION PRESENTED IN LABS: MORE OR LESS UNDERSTANDABLE THAN TV OR NEWSPAPER NEWS

How would you compare the information tonight to information from TV news. Was is more understandable, less, or the same as TV or newspaper news.	More than TV %	Less than TV %	Same as TV %	Not Sure %
Total	76	4	16	4
Male	73	5	17	5
Female	79	2	15	4
White	79	3	15	4
Black	64	8	19	9
Hispanic	68	4	26	3
18-29	75	6	15	4
30-39	72	5	20	4
40-49	75	3	18	4
50-64	80	2	12	6
65 and over	83	2	13	1
H.S. grad/less	75	5	13	7
Some college	77	3	17	3
College grad	75	5	20	1
Post grad	82	2	14	2
Democrat	74	4	18	5
Independent/other	80	3	16	2
Republican	79	4	13	3
Seattle	78	3	16	3
Baltimore	71	4	17	7
Chicago	75	6	16	3
San Antonio	77	2	18	4
Nashville	79	3	14	5

"How would you compare the presentation tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more understandable, less understandable, of about the same?"

TABLE 80

OVERALL CHANGE OF MIND ABOUT ANY ASPECT OF THE ISSUES

Did you change your mind about any aspect of this issue or think about the the issue in ways you had not previously considered	Yes %	No %	Not Sure %
Total	41	40	19
Male	34	51	16
Female	49	30	21
White	40	41	19
Black	45	42	13
Hispanic	39	41	20
18-29	43	37	20
30-39	45	38	16
40-49	43	47	10
50-64	38	34	28
65 and over	33	52	16
H.S. grad/less	37	36	26
Some college	38	44	18
College grad	48	45	7
Post grad	48	42	10
Democrat	45	38	17
Independent/other	38	41	21
Republican	38	45	17
Seattle	43	40	17
Baltimore	43	41	17
Chicago	43	42	16
San Antonio	36	40	24
Nashville	43	39	18

TABLE 81

AWARENESS OF PUBLIC SUMMIT 88

Have you heard of Public Summit 88	Yes %	No %	Not Sure %
Total	10	78	13
Male	8	84	8
Female	12	72	17
White	10	78	12
Black	7	79	13
Hispanic	8	75	17
18-29	10	76	15
30-39	9	80	11
40-49	9	78	13
50-64	12	78	11
65 and over	8	80	13
H.S. grad/less	7	79	14
Some college	8	79	13
College grad/more	13	76	11
Post grad	23	72	5
Democrat	9	78	14
Independent/other	14	75	12
Republican	9	80	12
Seattle	19	75	6
Baltimore	7	79	15
Chicago	2	82	16
San Antonio	9	80	11
Nashville	11	73	17

II. COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POSTTEST RESULTS

TABLE 1

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: POSTTEST SUMMARY TABLE

Possible Threats	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
The Soviet Union attacking other nations	27	39	26	8
The Soviet Union will launch an all nuclear attack on the U.S.	8	12	75	5
The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war	13	29	51	7
Damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries	30	44	22	4
We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak position	9	20	65	7
Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems like terrorism	32	42	22	5
A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war	14	39	38	8
We will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam	13	35	43	9
Marxism/communist will spread to more and more countries around the world	16	39	33	12
The Soviets will increase their support of terrorists and countries like Lybia	22	47	22	9
A country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will use nuclear weapons	18	43	31	9
Poor communications will cause a conflict to become a crisis that threatens war	18	45	30	6
We will neglect problems in the U.S. because of arms-race spending	29	43	25	3
A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by computer	8	18	64	10

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 2

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: PRETEST SUMMARY TABLE:

Possible Threats	Very Likely %	Fairly Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
The Soviet Union attacking other nations	30	39	22	9
The Soviet Union will launch an all nuclear attack on the U.S.	9	18	65	8
The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war	17	27	42	14
Damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries	36	37	20	8
We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak position	11	21	57	10
Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems like terrorism	26	46	20	8
A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war	17	34	35	14
We will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam	17	36	40	8
Marxism/communist will spread to more and more countries around the world	17	43	28	12
The Soviets will increase their support of terrorists and countries like Lybia	21	46	20	14
A country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will use nuclear weapons	20	41	28	10
Poor communications will cause a conflict to become a crisis that threatens war	21	46	25	8
We will neglect problems in the U.S. because of arms-race spending	33	36	26	4
A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by computer	11	22	54	14

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 3

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: SOVIET UNION ATTACKING OTHER NATIONS (SUCH AS AFGHANISTAN)

The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	27	30
Fairly likely	39	39
Not that likely	26	22
Not sure	8	9

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 4

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: SOVIET UNION LAUNCHING ALL OUT NUCLEAR ATTACK ON U.S.

Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S.	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	8	9
Fairly likely	12	18
Not that likely	75	65
Not sure	5	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 5

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY:
THE ARMS RACE WILL LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR

The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	13	17
Fairly likely	29	27
Not that likely	51	42
Not sure	7	14

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 6

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: DAMAGE TO OUR ECONOMY FROM DEFENDING OTHER COUNTRIES

We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Very likely	30	36
Fairly likely	44	37
Not that likely	22	20
Not sure	4	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 7

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: SIGNING AN ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT THAT WILL LEAVE US WEAK OR INFERIOR

We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	9	11
Fairly likely	20	21
Not that likely	65	57
Not sure	7	10

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 8

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: MISTRUST WILL KEEP US FROM WORKING WITH THE SOVIETS AGAINST REAL PROBLEMS

Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	32	26
Fairly likely	42	46
Not that likely	22	20
Not sure	5	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 9

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: A REGIONAL WAR WILL ESCALATE INTO ALL OUT WAR

A regional war (like the Middle East) will escalate into all out war	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	14	17
Fairly likely	39	34
Not that likely	38	35
Not sure	8	14

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 10

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: THE U.S. WILL GET BOGGED DOWN IN ANOTHER VIETNAM

The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	13	17
Fairly likely	35	36
Not that likely	43	40
Not sure	9	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 11

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: MARXISM AND COMMUNISM WILL SPREAD

Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Very likely	16	17
Fairly likely	39	43
Not that likely	33	28
Not sure	12	12

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 12

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: SOVIETS WILL INCREASE SUPPORT OF LYBIA AND OTHER TERRORISTS

The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Lybia and terrorist groups in the Middle East	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Very likely	22	21
Fairly likely	47	46
Not that likely	22	20
Not sure	9	14

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 13

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: A SMALLER COUNTRY WILL EVENTUALLY USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Very likely	18	20
Fairly likely	43	41
Not that likely	31	28
Not sure	9	10

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 14

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: POOR COMMUNICATION WILL CAUSE AN INCIDENT TO BECOME A CRISIS THAT THREATENS WAR

Poor communication will cause a conflict or an incident (like the downing of the Korean airlines) to become a crisis that threatens war	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Very likely	18	21
Fairly likely	45	46
Not that likely	30	25
Not sure	6	8

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 15

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: WE WILL NEGLECT PROBLEMS HERE BECAUSE OF SPENDING ON THE ARMS-RACE

We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Very likely	29	33
Fairly likely	43	36
Not that likely	25	26
Not sure	3	4

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 16

LIKELIHOOD OF POSSIBLE THREATS TO NATIONAL SECURITY: A NUCLEAR WEAPON WILL BE ACCIDENTALLY LAUNCHED BY A COMPUTER

A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally by a computer	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Very likely	8	11
Fairly likely	18	22
Not that likely	64	54
Not sure	10	14

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 17-1

SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	26	32
Somewhat favor	23	39
Somewhat oppose	17	11
Strongly oppose	24	9
Not sure	10	9

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.
CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they are backed into a corner."

TABLE 17-2

SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT

Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the third world)	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	21	64
Somewhat favor	34	25
Somewhat oppose	21	6
Strongly oppose	13	3
Not sure	11	3

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before a nuclear war.
CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements."

TABLE 17-3

SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons around the world	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	39	77
Somewhat favor	31	16
Somewhat oppose	13	3
Strongly oppose	8	3
Not sure	9	2

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us."

TABLE 17-4

SUPPORT FOR THE FOUR FUTURES
FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	14	13
Somewhat favor	15	20
Somewhat oppose	23	25
Strongly oppose	42	36
Not sure	7	6

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

POSTTEST PRO'S AND CON'S:
PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.
CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world."

TABLE 18

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION:
WANTS TO WORK WITH US TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Agree	55	45
Disagree	24	28
Not sure	21	27

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 19

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY WANT TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR AS MUCH AS WE DO

Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war as much as we do	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Agree	82	76
Disagree	9	12
Not sure	9	12

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 20

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WANT THE WORLD TO BE COMMUNIST AND WILL NOT STOP TRYING TO REACH THAT GOAL

No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Agree	53	51
Disagree	27	24
Not sure	21	25

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 21

STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: HAVE SO MANY PROBLEMS THEY DO NOT POSE MUCH OF A THREAT

The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S.	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Agree	17	14
Disagree	72	75
Not sure	12	11

"Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 22

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BUILD STAR WARS

We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars")	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	26	27
Somewhat favor	30	28
Somewhat oppose	20	16
Strongly oppose	19	19
Not sure	6	11

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms with the Soviets.'"

TABLE 23

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: AID ANTICOMMUNIST GROUPS IN THE THIRD WORLD

We should aid anticommunist groups and governments in the Third World	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	10	18
Somewhat favor	29	45
Somewhat oppose	28	17
Strongly oppose	25	14
Not sure	8	7

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy.'"

TABLE 24

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH THE SOVIETS TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	28	70
Somewhat favor	31	25
Somewhat oppose	19	2
Strongly oppose	17	1
Not sure	6	2

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if the only way to gain their trust is by sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars.'"

TABLE 25

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME AND END TREATY COMMITMENTS

We should work bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	7	14
Somewhat favor	13	23
Somewhat oppose	28	28
Strongly oppose	49	28
Not sure	4	8

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets.'"

TABLE 26

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: RECOGNIZE CUBA

We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	10	11
Somewhat favor	26	30
Somewhat oppose	22	19
Strongly oppose	32	21
Not sure	10	19

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere.'"

TABLE 27

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REACH AN AGREEMENT TO CUT BOTH SIDES' NUCLEAR ARSENALS

We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	17	57
Somewhat favor	30	28
Somewhat oppose	19	6
Strongly oppose	28	4
Not sure	6	5

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world.'"

TABLE 28

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REFUSE TO WORK WITH SOVIETS UNTIL THEY SHOW GREATER RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	12	12
Somewhat favor	24	27
Somewhat oppose	35	33
Strongly oppose	23	22
Not sure	5	7

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means not signing any arms control agreement.'"

TABLE 29

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE INCREASED MILITARY AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES TO HELP THEM FIGHT COMMUNISM

We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	13	13
Somewhat favor	31	33
Somewhat oppose	30	28
Strongly oppose	21	17
Not sure	6	9

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting.'"

TABLE 30

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: A JOINT U.S.-SOVIET MANNED MISSION TO MARS

We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	21	22
Somewhat favor	29	29
Somewhat oppose	21	15
Strongly oppose	22	18
Not sure	7	16

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means sharing our high technology.'"

TABLE 31

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MAKE OUR ALLIES PAY MORE OF THE COST OF THEIR DEFENSE

We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	37	55
Somewhat favor	41	28
Somewhat oppose	11	5
Strongly oppose	4	3
Not sure	7	9

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues.'"

TABLE 32

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIETS TO PREVENT REGIONAL CRISES FROM ESCALATING INTO GLOBAL WAR

We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Strongly favor	28	67
Somewhat favor	42	24
Somewhat oppose	13	3
Strongly oppose	7	2
Not sure	11	4

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose.'"

TABLE 33

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REACH AN AGREEMENT TO CUT BOTH SIDES' NUCLEAR ARSENALS

We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	37	57
Somewhat favor	37	28
Somewhat oppose	12	6
Strongly oppose	8	4
Not sure	6	5

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means increasing our nonnuclear, conventional (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches theirs.'"

TABLE 34

POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: STOP DEFENDING OTHER COUNTRIES AND JUST DEFEND NORTH AMERICA

We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Strongly favor	4	8
Somewhat favor	8	21
Somewhat oppose	21	31
Strongly oppose	64	33
Not sure	3	8

"Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

Posttest tradeoff: 'even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies.'"

TABLE 35

STATEMENT: THE SOVIETS TEST US AND ARE QUICK TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF WEAKNESS

The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Agree	71	68
Disagree	16	16
Not sure	13	16

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 36

STATEMENT: WE SHOULD LIVE AND LET LIVE WITH COMMUNISM

We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Agree	49	50
Disagree	37	34
Not sure	14	17

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 37

STATEMENT: THE SOVIET UNION IS AN EVIL EMPIRE

The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany, an evil empire trying to rule the world	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Agree	42	38
Disagree	39	42
Not sure	19	20

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 38

STATEMENT: BECAUSE THE SOVIETS WILL CHEAT, WE SHOULD NOT SIGN ANY NUCLEAR ARMS AGREEMENTS

Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms	POSTTEST %	PRETEST %
Agree	24	24
Disagree	61	55
Not sure	15	21

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 39

STATEMENT: THE U.S. WOULD BE SAFER IF WE LEARNED TO LIVE WITH THE SOVIETS THE WAY WE DO WITH CHINA AND YUGOSLAVIA

The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Agree	41	37
Disagree	43	45
Not sure	17	19

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 40

STATEMENT: SOMEDAY THE U.S. WILL HAVE TO FIGHT THE SOVIET UNION TO STOP COMMUNISM

When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism	POSTTEST	PRETEST
	%	%
Agree	23	26
Disagree	48	42
Not sure	29	33

"Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements."

III. PRETEST SUMMARY TABLES

TABLE 1

REACTION TO FUTURE ONE: THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND

Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	32	39	11	9	9
Male	31	39	12	9	9
Female	34	38	10	8	9
18-29	26	38	17	10	10
30-39	31	37	9	12	11
40-49	36	42	9	8	4
50-64	39	41	6	5	8
65 and over	32	41	11	8	9
H.S. grad/less	34	37	10	7	12
Some college	33	39	11	9	7
College grad	30	48	11	7	4
Post grad	26	39	12	15	9
Democrat	30	39	13	9	10
Independent/other	26	38	14	16	7
Republican	38	41	9	6	6
Seattle	22	34	17	21	7
Baltimore	31	42	9	6	12
Chicago	30	37	14	8	11
San Antonio	41	41	9	5	6
Nashville	39	41	7	4	9

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

TABLE 2

REACTION TO FUTURE TWO: ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT, COMPETE OTHERWISE

Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time fight communist expansion in the Third World	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	64	25	6	3	3
Male	62	26	6	4	3
Female	66	23	5	2	4
18-29	56	31	5	6	3
30-39	57	31	7	2	2
40-49	66	25	5	2	2
50-64	76	14	3	3	4
65 and over	71	17	7	1	5
H.S. grad/less	65	21	6	4	3
Some college	67	25	4	3	2
College grad	61	27	6	2	5
Post grad	55	36	7	2	--
Democrat	63	26	6	2	3
Independent/other	62	24	6	5	3
Republican	67	23	5	4	2
Seattle	54	28	11	4	3
Baltimore	68	23	5	1	3
Chicago	63	27	5	1	4
San Antonio	67	23	3	5	2
Nashville	67	22	4	3	4

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

TABLE 3

REACTION TO FUTURE THREE: COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	77	16	3	3	2
Male	79	14	3	3	1
Female	74	17	3	3	3
18-29	77	15	3	3	2
30-39	72	19	6	2	1
40-49	76	18	2	2	1
50-64	83	11	--	4	2
65 and over	75	15	2	3	5
H.S. grad/less	75	14	3	4	4
Some college	78	16	2	3	1
College grad	79	17	3	1	--
Post grad	74	18	5	2	--
Democrat	80	12	3	2	3
Independent/other	81	14	1	4	--
Republican	74	20	3	3	1
Seattle	83	12	2	1	1
Baltimore	77	13	4	4	3
Chicago	75	17	2	3	3
San Antonio	74	20	2	3	1
Nashville	74	17	4	2	2

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

TABLE 4

REACTION TO FUTURE FOUR: DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	13	20	25	36	6
Male	10	16	25	44	4
Female	16	23	25	27	8
18-29	8	20	24	41	7
30-39	9	16	27	41	7
40-49	10	16	32	38	4
50-64	18	23	22	32	6
65 and over	22	21	26	25	7
H.S. grad/less	18	24	27	24	8
Some college	12	20	23	39	6
College grad	4	14	24	55	3
Post grad	8	8	37	44	3
Democrat	17	22	27	29	6
Independent/other	9	24	29	30	8
Republican	9	16	22	48	5
Seattle	15	19	24	36	5
Baltimore	12	28	26	24	10
Chicago	15	19	27	36	4
San Antonio	13	16	24	42	6
Nashville	11	17	25	39	8

"People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010."

TABLE 5

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BUILD SDI OR "STAR WARS"

We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars")	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	27	28	16	19	11
Male	38	28	11	18	6
Female	16	28	21	20	15
18-29	18	30	20	19	12
30-39	26	30	16	22	5
40-49	25	27	19	20	10
50-64	33	27	12	13	15
65 and over	37	24	12	17	10
H.S. grad/less	24	28	20	15	13
Some college	29	25	15	21	10
College grad	31	33	14	18	4
Post grad	21	34	11	25	9
Democrat	20	24	21	22	13
Independent/other	23	27	15	27	8
Republican	38	33	12	10	7
Seattle	26	25	12	30	7
Baltimore	24	28	23	14	11
Chicago	27	24	17	23	10
San Antonio	33	29	15	11	11
Nashville	24	35	13	15	14

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 6

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE AID TO ANTICOMMUNIST GROUPS AND GOVERNMENTS

We should provide aid to anticommunist groups and governments	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	18	45	17	14	7
Male	20	46	16	12	6
Female	15	43	18	16	8
18-29	12	41	22	14	10
30-39	17	47	15	15	7
40-49	17	49	12	17	6
50-64	17	48	18	11	7
65 and over	26	40	16	13	5
H.S. grad/less	14	42	19	18	7
Some college	16	47	14	13	10
College grad	25	43	20	7	5
Post grad	20	50	14	14	2
Democrat	12	45	18	16	9
Independent/other	11	49	14	20	7
Republican	27	46	15	9	5
Seattle	13	37	19	19	13
Baltimore	17	43	16	15	9
Chicago	16	46	18	15	5
San Antonio	23	47	15	9	6
Nashville	20	49	16	11	3

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 7

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: WORK WITH SOVIETS TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	70	25	2	1	2
Male	74	22	2	1	2
Female	66	28	3	1	2
18-29	71	24	2	2	2
30-39	69	26	2	--	3
40-49	71	24	4	1	1
50-64	66	30	1	3	1
65 and over	71	23	3	2	2
H.S. grad/less	64	28	2	2	3
Some college	73	22	3	1	1
College grad	73	25	2	--	1
Post grad	67	30	2	2	--
Democrat	73	23	2	1	1
Independent/other	77	18	1	2	2
Republican	64	31	2	1	2
Seattle	73	22	2	1	2
Baltimore	71	23	2	1	3
Chicago	70	25	3	2	1
San Antonio	67	26	2	3	2
Nashville	67	28	3	--	2

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 8

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: BRING OUR TROOPS HOME FROM OVERSEAS AND END TREATY COMMITMENTS

We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	14	23	28	28	8
Male	11	21	30	33	5
Female	16	25	26	22	10
18-29	8	24	29	31	9
30-39	10	24	28	33	4
40-49	12	22	31	29	6
50-64	16	21	32	24	7
65 and over	25	20	23	20	13
H.S. grad/less	20	24	29	18	10
Some college	11	25	25	32	8
College grad	5	19	31	40	5
Post grad	9	14	38	36	4
Democrat	18	24	29	23	7
Independent/other	13	32	24	23	7
Republican	7	19	32	37	6
Seattle	15	21	29	25	10
Baltimore	19	27	29	18	7
Chicago	16	24	26	27	7
San Antonio	11	23	26	35	5
Nashville	7	20	30	34	10

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 9

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: RECOGNIZE AND ESTABLISH TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA

We should recognize and establish trade relations with Cuba	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	11	30	19	21	19
Male	16	33	17	21	13
Female	6	27	21	21	25
18-29	8	26	18	18	29
30-39	12	35	17	14	21
40-49	10	28	19	26	17
50-64	8	29	20	28	15
65 and over	18	30	22	21	10
H.S. grad/less	7	24	18	27	23
Some college	12	31	20	19	20
College grad	14	35	22	16	13
Post grad	13	37	17	18	15
Democrat	12	34	16	19	19
Independent/other	16	25	17	20	23
Republican	8	27	24	24	17
Seattle	21	31	15	17	16
Baltimore	10	33	11	24	22
Chicago	11	29	18	22	20
San Antonio	6	27	28	24	15
Nashville	6	30	23	18	23

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 10

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REACH AN AGREEMENT TO CUT BOTH SIDES' NUCLEAR ARSENALS DRASTICALLY

We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	57	28	6	4	5
Male	65	23	6	4	2
Female	50	32	6	3	8
18-29	54	30	8	4	5
30-39	63	23	6	2	5
40-49	55	32	5	5	4
50-64	53	32	7	4	4
65 and over	63	24	4	4	4
H.S. grad/less	52	34	5	4	6
Some college	64	23	7	4	4
College grad	60	25	6	4	5
Post grad	50	36	9	4	3
Democrat	61	26	5	2	6
Independent/other	60	31	3	4	1
Republican	53	29	8	5	4
Seattle	64	24	5	4	4
Baltimore	60	26	3	4	7
Chicago	57	32	7	2	2
San Antonio	51	32	9	6	2
Nashville	54	26	7	3	10

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 11

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: REFUSE TO WORK WITH SOVIETS UNTIL THEY SHOW RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	12	27	33	22	7
Male	14	26	33	23	5
Female	10	27	32	22	10
18-29	8	26	32	23	11
30-39	10	27	36	23	4
40-49	9	23	38	27	4
50-64	13	28	33	17	10
65 and over	15	32	26	19	8
H.S. grad/less	12	31	31	17	9
Some college	11	26	34	23	6
College grad	9	20	34	31	6
Post grad	6	25	39	25	4
Democrat	12	27	32	22	8
Independent/other	14	26	27	28	6
Republican	9	27	38	21	6
Seattle	6	21	37	30	6
Baltimore	17	26	28	23	7
Chicago	9	28	36	22	6
San Antonio	13	32	33	18	5
Nashville	13	25	31	19	12

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 12

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: PROVIDE INCREASED MILITARY AID TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	13	33	28	17	9
Male	15	33	29	16	7
Female	11	34	27	18	10
18-29	10	32	31	17	10
30-39	13	35	25	17	10
40-49	13	36	22	21	7
50-64	10	31	36	15	9
65 and over	17	33	28	16	6
H.S. grad/less	11	35	28	15	11
Some college	15	31	30	18	7
College grad	14	31	29	19	6
Post grad	7	41	24	19	8
Democrat	10	33	30	19	9
Independent/other	11	29	29	20	10
Republican	15	39	27	13	6
Seattle	8	24	33	28	8
Baltimore	13	32	31	14	11
Chicago	13	33	33	15	7
San Antonio	16	40	22	14	8
Nashville	16	39	23	14	9

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 13

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MANNED MISSION TO MARS WITH SOVIETS

We and the Soviets should work together on a joint, manned mission to the planet Mars	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	22	29	15	18	16
Male	29	32	12	16	12
Female	17	27	18	19	19
18-29	18	28	9	22	23
30-39	27	26	16	19	12
40-49	19	24	17	25	14
50-64	18	38	20	11	14
65 and over	34	28	19	8	11
H.S. grad/less	18	23	19	22	19
Some college	26	30	13	17	15
College grad	24	34	15	16	11
Post grad	24	37	15	14	10
Democrat	23	30	13	20	14
Independent/other	27	31	12	14	17
Republican	21	30	18	16	15
Seattle	34	31	14	12	10
Baltimore	24	30	12	20	13
Chicago	19	31	15	16	19
San Antonio	18	30	18	19	14
Nashville	16	24	15	23	21

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 14

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: MAKE OUR ALLIES (LIKE JAPAN AND GERMANY) PAY MORE OF THE COST OF THEIR DEFENSE

We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	55	28	5	3	9
Male	61	25	5	3	6
Female	50	32	5	2	11
18-29	34	33	9	4	19
30-39	49	35	7	3	6
40-49	59	31	3	2	5
50-64	71	22	3	1	3
65 and over	74	19	3	1	4
H.S. grad/less	48	31	6	3	12
Some college	57	27	6	3	8
College grad	62	31	3	1	3
Post grad	62	30	3	1	4
Democrat	53	30	5	3	9
Independent/other	46	37	6	3	8
Republican	64	25	4	1	5
Seattle	58	30	4	2	6
Baltimore	57	22	8	4	8
Chicago	52	27	5	2	13
San Antonio	59	27	6	1	8
Nashville	50	37	3	3	8

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 15

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIETS TO PREVENT LOCAL CRISES FROM ESCALATING INTO GLOBAL WAR

We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	67	24	3	2	4
Male	72	22	3	1	3
Female	63	26	3	2	6
18-29	63	29	3	2	4
30-39	66	26	5	--	4
40-49	71	18	4	4	4
50-64	71	22	1	2	4
65 and over	72	21	2	1	5
H.S. grad/less	64	22	3	3	7
Some college	68	26	2	1	2
College grad	74	23	2	--	2
Post grad	72	21	7	--	--
Democrat	69	23	3	2	3
Independent/other	66	26	3	2	2
Republican	69	23	3	2	4
Seattle	76	18	3	--	3
Baltimore	58	31	3	3	6
Chicago	73	19	3	2	3
San Antonio	61	28	4	2	5
Nashville	66	25	2	2	6

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 16

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: INCREASE OUR NONNUCLEAR STRENGTH TO EQUAL SOVIETS

We should increase our non-nuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches the level of the Soviet Union	Strongly Favor %	Somewhat Favor %	Somewhat Oppose %	Strongly Oppose %	Not Sure %
Total	44	32	12	6	6
Male	37	35	15	7	5
Female	51	28	9	6	6
18-29	38	35	16	6	7
30-39	45	25	17	8	5
40-49	40	35	11	7	7
50-64	49	35	8	3	6
65 and over	48	30	10	9	3
H.S. grad/less	50	29	8	7	7
Some college	42	31	16	7	5
College grad	32	42	13	7	6
Post grad	37	37	19	3	4
Democrat	43	33	12	7	4
Independent/other	31	39	12	9	9
Republican	49	28	13	5	5
Seattle	32	35	14	11	9
Baltimore	42	35	11	8	4
Chicago	40	39	11	5	5
San Antonio	54	36	12	4	4
Nashville	54	24	12	4	7

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 17

REACTION TO POSSIBLE U.S. POLICIES: STOP DEFENDING COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD AND DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA

We should stop defending other countries around the world and defend only North America	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%	%
Total	8	21	31	33	8
Male	7	17	34	37	5
Female	8	24	29	29	10
18-29	5	20	35	32	9
30-39	5	16	38	35	6
40-49	5	21	27	39	7
50-64	11	23	30	30	7
65 and over	14	27	25	28	6
H.S. grad/less	10	25	30	25	9
Some college	7	19	30	36	8
College grad	1	16	32	47	4
Post grad	6	14	43	34	3
Democrat	10	25	31	26	8
Independent/other	6	21	34	28	12
Republican	5	16	32	43	4
Seattle	10	24	28	30	8
Baltimore	7	25	29	26	13
Chicago	7	20	34	35	5
San Antonio	8	16	37	33	6
Nashville	7	19	29	41	5

"Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one."

TABLE 18

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE SOVIET UNION WILL ATTACK OTHER NATIONS THE WAY THEY INVADED AFGHANISTAN

The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	30	39	22	9
Male	25	41	28	7
Female	35	37	18	11
18-29	18	49	25	8
30-39	28	42	21	9
40-49	39	31	24	6
50-64	36	34	19	11
65 and over	31	37	25	8
H.S. grad/less	31	38	19	13
Some college	29	42	23	6
College grad	29	39	27	4
Post grad	26	36	32	6
Democrat	26	40	24	10
Independent/other	28	43	22	8
Republican	34	38	22	6
Seattle	21	38	33	8
Baltimore	28	35	27	10
Chicago	29	38	21	12
San Antonio	42	41	12	5
Nashville	31	41	20	9

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 19

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE SOVIET UNION WILL LAUNCH AN ALL OUT NUCLEAR ATTACK ON THE U.S.

Sooner of later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S.	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	9	18	65	8
Male	6	11	77	6
Female	11	26	54	10
18-29	8	19	65	8
30-39	9	15	69	7
40-49	8	18	69	5
50-64	9	18	63	10
65 and over	6	22	65	7
H.S. grad/less	11	21	56	11
Some college	7	20	68	6
College grad	5	12	81	2
Post grad	5	12	77	6
Democrat	9	17	64	10
Independent/other	7	17	73	4
Republican	6	20	69	5
Seattle	4	11	79	6
Baltimore	12	15	63	10
Chicago	5	19	66	10
San Antonio	14	27	50	9
Nashville	8	20	67	5

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 20

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE ARMS RACE WITH THE SOVIETS WILL LEAD TO NUCLEAR WAR

The arms race with the Soviets will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	17	27	42	14
Male	17	22	49	12
Female	17	32	36	16
18-29	21	30	37	13
30-39	17	30	38	15
40-49	15	28	46	10
50-64	15	24	46	16
65 and over	13	22	51	14
H.S. grad/less	18	29	37	16
Some college	18	28	40	13
College grad	12	25	54	9
Post grad	11	22	58	9
Democrat	20	25	42	13
Independent/other	18	33	35	15
Republican	11	27	50	13
Seattle	17	26	46	11
Baltimore	22	28	38	13
Chicago	13	25	47	15
San Antonio	18	28	38	16
Nashville	13	28	43	16

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 21

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: WE WILL DAMAGE OUR ECONOMY BY SPENDING TOO MUCH TO DEFEND OTHER COUNTRIES

We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	36	37	20	8
Male	35	37	21	7
Female	36	37	18	9
18-29	34	36	17	13
30-39	27	37	27	9
40-49	31	34	29	7
50-64	42	41	15	3
65 and over	44	28	13	5
H.S. grad/less	39	33	16	11
Some college	38	35	21	7
College grad	25	47	26	3
Post grad	24	44	27	5
Democrat	39	36	17	8
Independent/other	40	40	14	6
Republican	30	38	26	7
Seattle	41	34	18	7
Baltimore	33	42	16	9
Chicago	38	39	16	8
San Antonio	35	36	22	6
Nashville	32	34	25	9

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 22

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: WE WILL SIGN AN ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT THAT WILL LEAVE US IN A WEAK POSITION

We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	11	21	57	10
Male	11	21	59	8
Female	11	22	55	12
18-29	11	19	58	13
30-39	8	29	57	6
40-49	9	22	63	6
50-64	12	21	55	13
65 and over	14	22	52	12
H.S. grad/less	11	24	51	14
Some college	11	20	60	9
College grad	8	26	61	6
Post grad	9	19	66	6
Democrat	9	17	61	12
Independent/other	8	26	57	9
Republican	13	26	54	6
Seattle	11	20	61	8
Baltimore	9	17	61	14
Chicago	11	19	60	10
San Antonio	17	23	50	10
Nashville	9	28	53	10

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 23

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: MISTRUST AND HOSTILITY WILL KEEP US FROM WORKING WITH THE SOVIETS ON REAL PROBLEMS LIKE TERRORISM

Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	26	46	20	8
Male	25	48	20	7
Female	26	44	21	10
18-29	30	48	17	6
30-39	23	50	21	6
40-49	25	44	21	10
50-64	25	45	23	8
65 and over	21	45	25	9
H.S. grad/less	25	44	21	10
Some college	27	48	17	8
College grad	20	51	26	3
Post grad	25	45	26	4
Democrat	29	44	20	8
Independent/other	24	44	27	6
Republican	22	51	20	7
Seattle	24	46	21	10
Baltimore	29	43	18	10
Chicago	26	45	23	6
San Antonio	25	50	18	7
Nashville	24	45	22	9

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 24

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: A REGIONAL WAR (LIKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST) WILL ESCALATE INTO ALL OUT WAR

A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into an all out war	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	17	34	35	14
Male	15	32	43	10
Female	18	36	28	18
18-29	17	35	31	17
30-39	20	36	31	13
40-49	19	35	36	11
50-64	16	35	36	14
65 and over	11	33	44	12
H.S. grad/less	15	36	29	19
Some college	18	34	36	12
College grad	15	35	43	7
Post grad	20	32	40	7
Democrat	17	35	31	17
Independent/other	17	37	39	8
Republican	17	34	39	10
Seattle	13	37	37	13
Baltimore	20	30	35	16
Chicago	16	35	34	15
San Antonio	19	38	31	12
Nashville	16	30	41	13

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE U.S. WILL ACT AS "WORLD POLICEMAN" AND GET INTO ANOTHER VIETNAM

The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	17	36	40	8
Male	16	33	45	6
Female	17	38	35	10
18-29	12	41	38	9
30-39	18	40	33	9
40-49	19	35	40	6
50-64	15	33	45	6
65 and over	16	29	46	9
H.S. grad/less	17	34	38	11
Some college	17	35	41	7
College grad	9	45	41	6
Post grad	18	37	42	3
Democrat	17	40	34	9
Independent/other	14	34	49	3
Republican	15	32	46	7
Seattle	14	34	43	10
Baltimore	16	39	36	9
Chicago	15	34	42	8
San Antonio	22	37	35	6
Nashville	15	34	45	7

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 26

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: MARXISM/ COMMUNISM WILL SPREAD TO MORE COUNTRIES AROUND THE WORLD

Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	17	43	28	12
Male	17	44	30	9
Female	17	42	27	14
18-29	11	41	32	17
30-39	13	48	30	9
40-49	18	46	26	11
50-64	26	42	22	10
65 and over	15	40	37	8
H.S. grad/less	17	38	32	13
Some college	14	45	29	11
College grad	16	53	25	6
Post grad	16	46	24	14
Democrat	16	40	30	14
Independent/other	17	45	29	9
Republican	16	46	28	10
Seattle	12	46	30	12
Baltimore	16	36	33	15
Chicago	19	40	29	11
San Antonio	24	48	19	10
Nashville	15	44	30	12

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 27

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: THE SOVIETS WILL INCREASE THEIR SUPPORT OF COUNTRIES LIKE LYBIA AND OTHER TERRORISTS

The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Lybia and terrorist groups in the Middle East	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	21	46	20	14
Male	19	44	26	11
Female	23	47	14	16
18-29	15	45	24	16
30-39	19	47	21	13
40-49	24	50	15	11
50-64	26	46	15	13
65 and over	21	44	25	11
H.S. grad/less	22	43	20	16
Some college	19	50	20	11
College grad	20	47	25	9
Post grad	23	44	14	19
Democrat	19	44	21	16
Independent/other	16	46	30	9
Republican	24	50	15	11
Seattle	14	43	25	18
Baltimore	17	46	20	17
Chicago	17	49	22	13
San Antonio	32	43	18	8
Nashville	25	48	13	14

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 28

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: A SMALLER COUNTRY (LIKE PAKISTAN OR ISRAEL) WILL USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	20	41	28	10
Male	22	44	26	8
Female	18	39	30	13
18-29	18	45	25	13
30-39	20	36	34	11
40-49	22	45	29	5
50-64	20	42	27	10
65 and over	20	42	30	9
H.S. grad/less	18	38	31	13
Some college	21	43	27	8
College grad	25	44	22	8
Post grad	16	48	31	5
Democrat	20	39	30	12
Independent/other	19	46	28	7
Republican	21	43	27	9
Seattle	18	47	24	11
Baltimore	26	32	31	11
Chicago	15	42	30	13
San Antonio	21	44	26	9
Nashville	22	41	31	7

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 29

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: POOR COMMUNICATION WILL RESULT IN INCIDENTS BECOMING CRISES THAT THREATEN WAR

Poor communication will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	21	46	25	8
Male	20	45	29	7
Female	23	47	20	9
18-29	23	52	18	7
30-39	20	45	30	6
40-49	19	51	24	5
50-64	20	40	32	8
65 and over	21	42	26	11
H.S. grad/less	22	42	24	12
Some college	21	48	27	5
College grad	20	51	23	6
Post grad	18	54	27	1
Democrat	24	43	23	11
Independent/other	21	53	22	5
Republican	19	47	29	5
Seattle	20	46	27	7
Baltimore	21	45	23	11
Chicago	16	51	25	8
San Antonio	26	43	25	7
Nashville	24	45	24	7

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 30

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: WE WILL NEGLECT PROBLEMS IN THE U.S. BECAUSE WE SPEND SO MUCH ON A NEVER-ENDING ARMS RACE

We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	33	36	26	4
Male	32	37	27	4
Female	34	36	25	4
18-29	34	38	22	6
30-39	28	41	28	3
40-49	32	35	29	4
50-64	31	36	31	3
65 and over	37	33	26	5
H.S. grad/less	33	37	25	7
Some college	35	38	25	3
College grad	26	35	36	3
Post grad	31	41	26	2
Democrat	39	38	19	3
Independent/other	38	35	22	5
Republican	21	38	38	4
Seattle	38	36	23	4
Baltimore	35	36	23	7
Chicago	34	34	30	3
San Antonio	32	37	28	3
Nashville	28	40	27	5

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 31

POSSIBLE THREATS TO THE U.S.: A NUCLEAR WEAPON WILL BE LAUNCHED ACCIDENTALLY BY A COMPUTER

A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Not that Likely %	Not Sure %
Total	11	22	54	14
Male	8	21	58	14
Female	14	22	50	14
18-29	11	25	49	15
30-39	10	22	56	12
40-49	11	21	55	14
50-64	11	20	57	13
65 and over	11	18	58	14
H.S. grad/less	13	22	48	17
Some college	9	23	55	14
College grad	10	20	65	6
Post grad	11	16	65	8
Democrat	14	20	50	17
Independent/other	9	27	53	11
Republican	7	22	61	10
Seattle	6	22	57	15
Baltimore	14	23	53	10
Chicago	10	27	46	18
San Antonio	13	19	53	15
Nashville	13	17	58	12

"Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is."

TABLE 32

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: TRULY WANT TO WORK WITH US TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS

The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	45	28	27
Male	51	28	21
Female	40	29	32
18-29	46	27	28
30-39	50	27	24
40-49	46	30	24
50-64	40	31	29
65 and over	48	28	25
H.S. grad/less	41	28	30
Some college	49	26	25
College grad	44	34	22
Post grad	55	28	17
Democrat	44	26	30
Independent/other	52	26	22
Republican	45	30	25
Seattle	63	16	20
Baltimore	44	29	27
Chicago	43	29	28
San Antonio	39	37	24
Nashville	37	30	34

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 33

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THOUGH THEY MAY NEVER BE FRIENDS, THEY WANT TO REDUCE THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR AS MUCH AS WE DO

Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	76	12	12
Male	82	9	9
Female	70	15	15
18-29	77	13	11
30-39	80	7	13
40-49	78	12	10
50-64	70	16	14
65 and over	81	9	10
H.S. grad/less	69	16	16
Some college	80	10	10
College grad	87	5	8
Post grad	83	10	7
Democrat	77	10	13
Independent/other	75	12	13
Republican	79	11	10
Seattle	86	4	10
Baltimore	73	12	14
Chicago	78	9	13
San Antonio	69	20	11
Nashville	75	13	12

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 34

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY WANT EVERY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD TO BE COMMUNIST AND WILL NEVER STOP TRYING TO REACH THAT GOAL

No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	51	24	25
Male	52	28	20
Female	51	20	29
18-29	35	38	28
30-39	51	26	23
40-49	59	20	21
50-64	60	16	24
65 and over	61	16	23
H.S. grad/less	46	25	28
Some college	58	24	19
College grad	52	23	25
Post grad	52	26	23
Democrat	47	23	30
Independent/other	50	30	21
Republican	59	23	18
Seattle	43	30	27
Baltimore	49	18	32
Chicago	48	29	24
San Antonio	59	21	20
Nashville	56	24	20

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 35

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY HAVE SO MANY OF THEIR OWN PROBLEMS THEY DON'T REALLY POSE A THREAT

The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S.	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	14	75	11
Male	18	72	11
Female	10	79	11
18-29	13	75	12
30-39	10	80	11
40-49	13	81	6
50-64	11	78	11
65 and over	21	64	16
H.S. grad/less	14	74	13
Some college	13	78	9
College grad	14	76	11
Post grad	11	79	11
Democrat	12	75	13
Independent/other	17	75	8
Republican	12	79	8
Seattle	21	64	14
Baltimore	12	81	7
Chicago	11	79	10
San Antonio	10	81	9
Nashville	13	72	15

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 36

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WHILE THEY MAY BE RUTHLESS, THEY ARE NOT RECKLESS OR IRRATIONAL

While the leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	67	15	18
Male	74	12	14
Female	60	19	21
18-29	64	15	21
30-39	68	16	16
40-49	69	15	16
50-64	66	18	16
65 and over	73	10	17
H.S. grad/less	56	22	23
Some college	72	11	17
College grad	75	12	13
Post grad	86	7	7
Democrat	67	15	18
Independent/other	67	13	20
Republican	71	15	14
Seattle	79	6	16
Baltimore	67	22	11
Chicago	66	14	21
San Antonio	63	21	16
Nashville	62	15	24

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 37

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY WILL CHEAT ON ANY NUCLEAR ARMS AGREEMENT THEY SIGN

The Soviets will cheat on any nuclear arms agreement they sign	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	40	24	36
Male	43	27	30
Female	37	21	42
18-29	30	33	38
30-39	36	26	37
40-49	40	22	38
50-64	49	15	36
65 and over	49	19	32
H.S. grad/less	36	23	42
Some college	44	21	35
College grad	43	24	33
Post grad	38	36	27
Democrat	34	26	40
Independent/other	42	28	31
Republican	47	19	34
Seattle	31	32	37
Baltimore	34	27	39
Chicago	37	30	34
San Antonio	55	14	31
Nashville	42	18	40

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 38

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WE WILL NEVER BE SAFE WITH OUT A CLEAR MILITARY EDGE OVER THE SOVIETS

We will never be safe without a clear, decisive military edge over the Soviet Union	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	52	31	18
Male	45	39	16
Female	58	23	19
18-29	42	43	15
30-39	50	32	18
40-49	50	34	16
50-64	60	20	20
65 and over	59	21	20
H.S. grad/less	58	23	19
Some college	49	31	20
College grad	42	43	15
Post grad	43	48	10
Democrat	50	31	18
Independent/other	42	44	15
Republican	58	27	16
Seattle	35	46	19
Baltimore	50	31	19
Chicago	45	32	23
San Antonio	70	17	13
Nashville	58	26	15

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 39

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WE'RE SO CONCERNED ABOUT THE SOVIETS THAT WE'RE LOSING TO ECONOMIC RIVALS LIKE JAPAN

We're so concerned about our military rival, the Soviet Union, that we're losing to our economic rivals such as Japan and Germany	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	57	20	23
Male	60	22	18
Female	54	19	28
18-29	48	24	28
30-39	51	23	27
40-49	57	25	18
50-64	62	17	21
65 and over	68	15	17
H.S. grad/less	48	23	29
Some college	59	20	22
College grad	64	20	16
Post grad	68	20	12
Democrat	60	18	22
Independent/other	62	18	21
Republican	53	24	23
Seattle	63	17	20
Baltimore	51	21	29
Chicago	58	22	20
San Antonio	57	22	22
Nashville	55	21	24

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 40

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: WORKING TO SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS WOULD BE A MISTAKE BECAUSE THEY WOULD STEAL OUR HIGH TECHNOLOGY

Working with the Soviets to solve common problems would be a serious mistake because they would take advantage of us and steal our high technology	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	28	51	22
Male	29	55	17
Female	27	47	27
18-29	20	57	23
30-39	26	55	19
40-49	26	54	20
50-64	30	47	23
65 and over	36	41	24
H.S. grad/less	30	44	26
Some college	30	50	21
College grad	18	67	15
Post grad	21	64	16
Democrat	27	51	22
Independent/other	25	52	22
Republican	29	50	21
Seattle	22	61	17
Baltimore	30	52	17
Chicago	23	49	29
San Antonio	37	42	21
Nashville	27	49	25

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 41

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION: THEY ARE READY TO 'DO BUSINESS' JUST LIKE THE CHINESE IN THE 1970's

The new Soviet leaders are ready to "do business" with us just like the Chinese were in the 1970's	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	39	16	46
Male	48	15	37
Female	30	16	54
18-29	35	14	51
30-39	41	20	40
40-49	39	13	49
50-64	36	16	48
65 and over	46	17	37
H.S. grad/less	30	19	51
Some college	41	13	45
College grad	46	11	43
Post grad	52	21	27
Democrat	38	17	45
Independent/other	40	14	46
Republican	41	15	45
Seattle	51	16	33
Baltimore	35	15	49
Chicago	34	16	51
San Antonio	37	17	46
Nashville	37	15	49

"Mark if you agree if disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union."

TABLE 42

VIEW OF THE RESULTS OF AN IMPROVED SOVIET ECONOMY

If the Soviets became better off, would they be more or less of a threat	More a Threat %	Less a Threat %	Not Sure %
Total	47	33	19
Male	44	40	16
Female	50	28	22
18-29	41	36	23
30-39	44	33	23
40-49	52	31	16
50-64	56	26	19
65 and over	48	40	11
H.S. grad/less	47	30	23
Some college	49	34	16
College grad	49	32	20
Post grad	44	43	13
Democrat	43	36	21
Independent/other	46	35	19
Republican	54	31	15
Seattle	37	43	19
Baltimore	43	37	20
Chicago	41	36	23
San Antonio	63	21	16
Nashville	53	30	17

"Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

Statement A: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would use their increased wealth to stir up trouble by funding communist revolutionaries around the world.
OR
Statement B: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would become less of a threat because they would have more to lose in conflict."

TABLE 43

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE SOVIETS ARE CONSTANTLY TESTING US FOR WEAKNESS AND ARE QUICK TO TAKE ADVANTAGE WHEN THEY FIND IT

The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	68	16	16
Male	70	15	14
Female	66	17	17
18-29	54	22	24
30-39	63	21	17
40-49	74	18	9
50-64	80	8	12
65 and over	76	11	13
H.S. grad/less	65	17	19
Some college	69	15	16
College grad	71	19	11
Post grad	71	17	12
Democrat	67	18	16
Independent/other	65	20	15
Republican	73	12	15
Seattle	57	22	21
Baltimore	68	19	14
Chicago	66	19	16
San Antonio	76	10	14
Nashville	75	12	13

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 44

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: WE SHOULD LIVE AND LET LIVE WITH COMMUNISTS

We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	50	34	17
Male	57	29	14
Female	43	38	19
18-29	51	31	18
30-39	49	35	17
40-49	45	36	19
50-64	49	36	16
65 and over	56	30	14
H.S. grad/less	48	35	17
Some college	51	33	16
College grad	50	30	20
Post grad	52	34	14
Democrat	51	31	17
Independent/other	60	28	12
Republican	44	39	17
Seattle	62	25	13
Baltimore	53	27	20
Chicago	47	35	18
San Antonio	44	42	14
Nashville	42	39	19

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 45

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE SOVIET UNION IS LIKE HITLER'S GERMANY -- AND EVIL EMPIRE TRYING TO RULE THE WORLD

The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	38	42	20
Male	33	49	17
Female	43	35	22
18-29	30	52	19
30-39	32	52	16
40-49	37	42	21
50-64	51	27	22
65 and over	41	34	25
H.S. grad/less	41	36	23
Some college	40	38	22
College grad	32	54	14
Post grad	24	64	12
Democrat	37	43	20
Independent/other	32	43	26
Republican	42	41	18
Seattle	22	58	20
Baltimore	38	34	28
Chicago	38	45	17
San Antonio	54	27	19
Nashville	38	46	16

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 46

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE U.S. BLAMES THE SOVIETS FOR TROUBLES IN OTHER COUNTRIES CAUSED BY POVERTY, HUNGER AND REPRESSION

The U.S. often blames the Soviet Union for troubles in other countries that are really caused by poverty, hunger, political corruption and repression	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	44	32	24
Male	49	31	20
Female	40	32	28
18-29	42	30	28
30-39	36	39	25
40-49	46	31	24
50-64	44	35	21
65 and over	55	25	20
H.S. grad/less	36	36	28
Some college	45	29	27
College grad	56	30	14
Post grad	56	35	10
Democrat	46	30	24
Independent/other	50	29	21
Republican	42	36	23
Seattle	56	23	21
Baltimore	42	29	30
Chicago	44	38	18
San Antonio	41	35	24
Nashville	39	34	27

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 47

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: BECAUSE THE SOVIETS WILL NOT KEEP THEIR END OF THE BARGAIN, WE SHOULD NOT SIGN ANY NUCLEAR ARMS AGREEMENTS

Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	24	55	21
Male	18	64	18
Female	30	47	23
18-29	25	56	19
30-39	20	58	22
40-49	26	59	15
50-64	24	51	26
65 and over	20	59	22
H.S. grad/less	30	45	25
Some college	23	58	19
College grad	11	74	15
Post grad	16	73	11
Democrat	23	56	21
Independent/other	21	59	20
Republican	22	58	19
Seattle	16	67	16
Baltimore	23	55	22
Chicago	25	55	21
San Antonio	29	50	21
Nashville	27	49	24

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 48

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: FORCE IS THE ONLY LANGUAGE THE SOVIETS UNDERSTAND

The only language the Soviets understand is force, and we have to prove to them that they can't push us around	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	43	42	15
Male	42	46	12
Female	44	38	18
18-29	37	49	14
30-39	40	47	13
40-49	38	49	13
50-64	49	31	21
65 and over	53	32	16
H.S. grad/less	51	36	13
Some college	38	46	16
College grad	38	47	15
Post grad	32	51	17
Democrat	38	45	17
Independent/other	40	49	11
Republican	52	35	13
Seattle	31	53	16
Baltimore	41	41	18
Chicago	44	44	12
San Antonio	50	34	16
Nashville	49	38	14

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 49

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE U.S. WOULD BE SAFER IF IT LEARNED TO LIVE WITH COMMUNISM

The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to stop the spread of communism and learned to live with them, the way we live with China and Yugoslavia	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	37	45	19
Male	41	44	15
Female	32	46	22
18-29	40	39	21
30-39	40	44	17
40-49	30	52	18
50-64	31	49	20
65 and over	39	49	13
H.S. grad/less	32	50	18
Some college	39	41	20
College grad	32	52	16
Post grad	46	37	17
Democrat	41	41	18
Independent/other	46	32	21
Republican	29	56	15
Seattle	55	33	12
Baltimore	36	41	23
Chicago	35	47	18
San Antonio	27	54	20
Nashville	30	50	20

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 50

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: ONE DAY THE U.S. WILL HAVE TO FIGHT THE SOVIET UNION TO STOP COMMUNISM

When all is said and done, one day the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	26	42	33
Male	20	50	30
Female	32	33	35
18-29	29	40	32
30-39	27	42	31
40-49	22	44	34
50-64	27	39	34
65 and over	22	46	32
H.S. grad/less	32	32	36
Some college	27	41	33
College grad	18	59	23
Post grad	10	58	32
Democrat	24	45	31
Independent/other	23	44	33
Republican	27	40	34
Seattle	14	59	27
Baltimore	25	40	35
Chicago	23	42	35
San Antonio	40	31	30
Nashville	28	36	37

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 51

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: IF WE HAD A BIGGER NUCLEAR ARSENAL THAN THE SOVIETS, THEY WOULD BUILD UNTIL THEY CAUGHT UP

If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets, they would keep building until they caught up	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	83	6	12
Male	85	6	10
Female	81	5	14
18-29	85	4	11
30-39	82	7	11
40-49	78	6	16
50-64	82	5	13
65 and over	87	6	8
H.S. grad/less	79	7	15
Some college	83	6	11
College grad	88	4	9
Post grad	87	3	10
Democrat	82	5	13
Independent/other	84	4	12
Republican	86	5	9
Seattle	79	7	14
Baltimore	81	5	14
Chicago	81	9	11
San Antonio	88	2	9
Nashville	85	4	11

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 52

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THAT ALL LIFE ON EARTH COULD BE DESTROYED IN A NUCLEAR WAR IS A WILD EXAGGERATION

The idea that all life on earth could be destroyed in a nuclear war is a wild exaggeration	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	13	80	8
Male	15	79	6
Female	11	81	9
18-29	8	83	9
30-39	8	88	4
40-49	11	85	4
50-64	17	76	7
65 and over	21	67	12
H.S. grad/less	16	76	9
Some college	11	84	5
College grad	11	80	8
Post grad	6	87	6
Democrat	12	80	8
Independent/other	10	84	6
Republican	15	79	7
Seattle	10	83	7
Baltimore	15	77	9
Chicago	16	78	7
San Antonio	12	78	9
Nashville	11	82	7

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 52

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: TO GUARANTEE AMERICA'S SECURITY, WE MUST HAVE A NUCLEAR ARSENAL EQUAL TO, BUT NOT GREATER THAN, THE SOVIET'S

To guarantee America's security, we must have a nuclear arsenal equal to, but not greater than the Soviet Union's	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	38	45	17
Male	39	45	16
Female	37	46	18
18-29	31	52	17
30-39	34	50	16
40-49	33	48	18
50-64	44	39	17
65 and over	54	31	15
H.S. grad/less	36	45	19
Some college	37	47	16
College grad	44	43	13
Post grad	43	43	14
Democrat	38	48	14
Independent/other	44	39	17
Republican	37	45	18
Seattle	38	43	19
Baltimore	32	50	18
Chicago	38	49	13
San Antonio	39	49	12
Nashville	43	36	21

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 54

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: THE U.S. SHOULD ALWAYS HAVE MORE NUCLEAR WEAPONS THAN THE SOVIETS

The U.S. should always have more nuclear weapons than the Soviets	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
	%	%	%
Total	33	47	20
Male	24	58	19
Female	41	37	22
18-29	23	52	25
30-39	25	56	19
40-49	36	46	18
50-64	45	34	21
65 and over	37	47	16
H.S. grad/less	43	33	24
Some college	28	54	19
College grad	21	60	19
Post grad	26	61	13
Democrat	37	43	19
Independent/other	21	58	22
Republican	32	48	20
Seattle	14	65	21
Baltimore	41	37	22
Chicago	35	48	18
San Antonio	38	46	17
Nashville	36	40	24

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 55

AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT: NOTHING ON EARTH COULD EVER JUSTIFY THE ALL OUT USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Nothing on earth could ever justify the all out use of nuclear weapons	Agree %	Disagree %	Not Sure %
Total	79	10	12
Male	77	12	11
Female	80	7	13
18-29	76	9	15
30-39	81	9	11
40-49	76	8	16
50-64	83	9	8
65 and over	82	11	7
H.S. grad/less	77	7	16
Some college	81	8	11
College grad	85	10	5
Post grad	77	18	5
Democrat	81	6	13
Independent/other	80	12	8
Republican	77	13	10
Seattle	89	6	5
Baltimore	74	11	15
Chicago	84	10	7
San Antonio	70	12	18
Nashville	78	8	15

"Indicate whether you agree if disagree with the following statements."

TABLE 56

MOST LIKELY WAY A NUCLEAR WAR WILL START

The most likely way a nuclear war will start	Soviets Invade Europe %	Thrd Wrld Escalates %	Terrorist Uses Nuke %	Accident %
Total	15	52	21	12
Male	10	56	24	10
Female	19	49	18	14
18-29	14	56	20	10
30-39	12	51	21	15
40-49	15	58	17	10
50-64	15	53	22	9
65 and over	16	40	29	15
H.S. grad/less	20	46	19	15
Some college	13	55	19	13
College grad	10	56	28	7
Post grad	6	62	26	5
Democrat	17	52	21	10
Independent/other	10	43	31	17
Republican	13	58	19	11
Seattle	8	59	22	11
Baltimore	17	54	16	13
Chicago	17	50	20	14
San Antonio	22	44	21	13
Nashville	11	53	26	10

"Experts feel that there are different ways in which a nuclear war might start. Consider each of the following and indicate which one you think is the most likely to lead to nuclear war. Mark only one answer.

A. The Soviets will invade Europe or launch a surprise attack with nuclear weapons against the U.S.

B. A war in the Third World (for example, in the Middle East) will escalate and draw in the superpowers.

C. Terrorists or a mad man will use a nuclear weapon.

D. A nuclear weapon will be launched by accident."

TABLE 57

IF THE SOVIETS HAD INVENTED THE ATOMIC BOMB: HOW THEY WOULD HAVE USED IT

If history had been changed and the Soviets had invented the A-bomb, what would they have done	Attack the U.S.	Intimidate the U.S.	Only to Defend	Not Sure
	%	%	%	%
Total	22	50	15	13
Male	21	52	16	11
Female	22	47	15	15
18-29	17	44	23	16
30-39	22	54	13	11
40-49	32	41	14	13
50-64	22	53	14	12
65 and over	13	64	12	12
H.S. grad/less	19	49	14	19
Some college	24	49	17	11
College grad	22	56	14	8
Post grad	22	51	19	8
Democrat	23	48	17	13
Independent/other	22	47	15	16
Republican	23	56	14	7
Seattle	20	50	21	10
Baltimore	23	46	17	14
Chicago	21	52	14	13
San Antonio	25	50	12	14
Nashville	22	51	14	14

"Imagine that history were changed and the Soviet Union, not the United States, invented the atomic bomb. Imagine that the Soviet Union used A-bombs on Japan to end the World War II, and that they were the only country in the wold with atomic (or nuclear) weapons from 1945 until about 1955. If history were different, what do you think would have happened?

A. Sometime between 1945 and 1955, the Soviets would have attacked the U.S. with atomic bombs between, thereby defeating their strongest enemy.

B. The Soviets would have tried to intimidate the U.S. by threatening to use atomic bombs, but they would never have actually exploded any; their goal is to take over the U.S., not to blow it up.

C. The Soviets would have used atomic weapons only to defend themselves and their allies.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Methodology

This study of public opinion was designed to explore Americans' desires about the future of U.S. relations with the Soviet Union, but in an unusual way: we wanted to assess people's considered, realistic preferences, and so we measured their views after they had time to consider the risks, costs and implications of trying to reach very different goals. We asked people to consider four visions of the future, or futures, each depicting a different view of what U.S.-Soviet relations might be in the year 2010. The futures were developed to represent credible and balanced alternatives that would allow us to explore people's preferences. The study was strictly nonpartisan; the futures were developed and reviewed by foreign policy experts from points of view all along the political spectrum. Our goal was to see what people's considered judgments would be after they had time to consider the pro and con arguments and weigh the implications of trying to make each future a reality.

Public Summit 88

The study was part of a larger project that included a four week citizen education effort called Public Summit 88. Public Summit was cosponsored by local newspapers, television and radio stations in four cities: Baltimore, San Antonio, Nashville, and Seattle. It was designed to parallel the study by asking people in the four cities to consider the same four futures, and their pros and cons. The effort culminated with the return of more than 76,000 "ballots," brief questionnaires in which residents in the four cities answered some of the same questions used in the panel study.

The design of the study grew out of a 1984 report by the Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University called Voter Options. A national survey of public opinion about the nuclear arms race and U.S.-Soviet relations found that Americans' views about these issues were often characterized by inconsistency, and such inconsistency was most pronounced when people thought about the long- and short-term. That is, people often favored immediate policies that would take the country in a direction opposite from what they said they wanted to go. To enable people to consider and reconcile these inconsistencies, we designed a study in which they were asked to simultaneously consider both the short- and long-term.

The Need for a New Methodology: Limitations of Existing Methods

In order to ask people their preferences about alternative visions of U.S.-Soviet relations in the year 2010, we had to give respondents a great deal of information. First, people had to understand the possibilities (that is, the four futures), then they had to see the relationship between short-term policies and each of the the various long-term objectives. It would have been impossible to provide so much information with traditional survey methods and so a method had to be developed that would enable us to do so.

The two principle methods of public opinion research -- survey research and focus groups -- each have certain advantages. Like other qualitative methods, focus groups, structured group interviews led by an impartial professional moderator, permit textured, idiosyncratic responses. In contrast to survey research, which is necessarily based upon certain preconceptions about how respondents approach an issue, focus group research allows people to speak for themselves. Focus groups reveal the intensity with which views are held, and yield insights about why people hold certain views, the values that are applied when they consider an issue, and the assumptions on which opinions are based. Focus groups provide a way of gauging how views change when people consider new information or confront a new problem they are asked to solve. In sum, focus groups provide a multi-dimensional understanding of how people think and feel. They are an especially valuable method when trying to understand people's thinking about complex, value-laden issues such as U.S.-Soviet relations.

However, focus groups have certain weaknesses. Since the number of respondents in a group is limited (a dozen people attend a typical session), even several groups will not enable a researcher to make statistically reliable generalizations about the population as a whole. Although, in many cases, respondents are representative of their community, one cannot generalize with confidence from such a small sample. Strictly speaking, the results of focus groups, like other qualitative methods, yield only plausible and promising hypotheses that can be validated by quantitative methods.

The strengths and limits of survey research using a probability or random sample are the mirror image of focus groups. With a national probability sample, one can generalize about the whole country within a statistically predictable range of sampling error. Such research permits quantitative analysis, including percentage breakdowns and analysis of demographic subgroups. However, even the most sophisticated questionnaire may elicit an incomplete portrait of how people feel about an issue. Key words or phrases may trigger a response that is quite different from what a slightly different wording elicits. Even pretesting may not identify all such key words and phrases. Additionally, survey research is not good for probing value differences, or gauging the premises or assumptions on which people's thinking is based.

Survey research is useful with issues that people already know about. But since only a limited amount of information can be communicated during an interview, surveys can provide only limited insights into how people change their minds when they consider new information or arguments. Further, surveys can not reveal what happens when people have a chance to talk to others or to consider a new idea for at least a few minutes. Consequently, surveys are not very useful for measuring people's views about largely unfamiliar or very complex ideas.

The Citizen Review Panels

In order to gauge public reactions to the four futures, the Public Agenda/Brown Center used an innovative variation of a panel study called Citizen Review Panels, a method developed by the Public Agenda and used in a study for the Ford Foundation. (See "The Public's Perspective on Social Welfare Reform" by Keith Melville and John Doble, The Public Agenda Foundation, January, 1988.) This method combines the strengths of focus groups and survey research, of both qualitative *and* quantitative research.

The panels consist of a large, demographically representative sample, and so permit us to quantify results. And since the panels are structured to maximize discussion, they permit a detailed analysis of responses to complex or unfamiliar proposals. Also, the panels are long enough to enable us to introduce a good deal of new information.

A total of 963 people from five cities were interviewed for about three hours each. To enable those with day jobs to attend (and thus get a more representative sample), we held the sessions on weeknights, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. The panels were conducted in five cities: Baltimore (on Monday and Tuesday, January 4 and 5); Nashville (on Wednesday and Thursday, January 6 and 7); San Antonio (on Monday and Tuesday, January 11 and 12); Seattle (on Wednesday and Thursday, January 13 and 14); and Chicago (on Monday and Tuesday, January 18 and 19.)

Briefly, two sessions were conducted each night, involving about fifty people who represented a cross section of the community. We first announced that two nonprofit, nonpartisan research organizations wanted to learn people's views about four visions of the future of U.S.-Soviet relations. We emphasized that there were no "right" or "wrong" answers, that we took no position on the issues, that we were interested only in their opinions and knowing why they felt as they did.

Respondents filled out a pretest questionnaire, then saw a video presenting the four futures and pro and con arguments related to each. They then broke up into groups of about fifteen for a forty-five minute discussion led by a trained moderator.* Handouts describing the futures and listing key arguments for and against each were distributed to aid comprehension; the discussion consisted of a structured review of each future and the key arguments for and against. Next, respondents reconvened to watch the second half of the video, the policy implications of the four futures. Then they separated for a second discussion lasting about thirty minutes. Finally, respondents filled out a posttest in which many of the original, pretest items were repeated. Upon completing the second questionnaire, respondents received an incentive payment of $35.00.

---

* The Human Organization Science Institute at Villanova University was used to recruit and train the moderators who were members of the faculty at Villanova University and St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia. Training was carried out under the direction of Richard Smoke, John Immerwahr and John Doble.

The Materials for the Panels

In order to use this method, we first had to decide on the futures to be tested. Developed by the Brown Center and the Public Agenda, the futures presented four different views of what U.S.-Soviet relations might be like in the year 2010. To insure that the range of policy options involved in the four futures was simultaneously politically relevant, balanced and engaging to the public, the Public Agenda and the Brown Center collaborated for more than two years, conducting research with both experts and the public, including:

1. Weekly seminars at Brown University and a series of workshops with experts at institutions such as:
    - The American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C.;
    - The National Defense University in Washington, D.C.;
    - The International Institute for East-West Security Studies in New York;
    - The International Institute for Strategic Studies in London;
    - The Atlantic Institute in Paris;
    - The Soviet Institute for U.S. and Canada Studies in Moscow;

2. Consultations with key staff of the Senate and House Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, the State Department, and members of the Reagan Administration;

3. Extensive conversations with the project's National Council, a bipartisan group of more than eighty prominent Americans representing a broad range of viewpoints and experience;

4. A series of workshops with community leaders in ten American cities;

5. A series of focus groups in which the futures were tested for perceived bias and understandability.

* See Part V. for copies of the handouts used in the panels: arguments for and against each future, and the policy implications related to each.

Once the futures were decided on, the Public Agenda/Brown Center designed two questionnaires. The first, a pretest administered at the start of the evening, was designed to assess respondents' "starting point" including their views about threats to national security, the Soviets, and a variety of different policies. The second questionnaire, a posttest administered at the end of the evening, after respondents had seen the videos and discussed the futures, repeated many of the pretest items so that we could measure change. The posttest also asked about the arguments for and against each future and about the policy implications related to each. Though self-administered, the questionnaires were filled out while project staff circulated around the room to ensure that respondents did not confer or compare answers.

Before respondents could consider and discuss the four futures, they had to understand them thoroughly. Because of the amount of information to be presented and the clarity with which information could be conveyed, we used a videotape (made expressly for the project) to present the four futures. To increase comprehension, the video was divided into two presentations of about twelve minutes each. The first video presented the four futures rather thoroughly; the second reviewed the futures, then presented the short-term policies necessary to enact each future. The videos were written and produced by Jeffrey Tuchman, Public Agenda's Media Director, and Associate Producer Julie Lewis in close consulation with Richard Smoke of the Brown Center. Before their use in the panels, the videos were tested for bias and comprehension in several focus groups.

We also had to decide about the content and format of the discussion sessions. A primary concern was to make the sessions as similar as possible so that respondents working with one moderator in one city would have an experience similar to those who worked with another. A number of measures were taken to ensure comparability. Before the panels, the moderators were thoroughly briefed on the content of the project by Richard Smoke; John Immerwahr, John Doble and Richard Smoke worked with the group, instructing them how to present the material, handle the discussion, and respond to particular questions that might arise.

In the discussions, moderators worked within a structure that was carefully developed in advance. Moderators gave each respondent a summary sheet listing the pro and con arguments for each future, and the policy implications for each. Keyed to the video, these summaries were a memory aide for respondents, and also served as a script, enabling moderators to maintain a parallel structure in each of the discussion groups.

The discussions were administered so that the same amount of time was spent discussing each proposal. Moderators made sure that the most important arguments for and against each proposal (identified ahead of time) were aired in each session, either by one of the participants or by the moderators themselves. Finally, the groups were monitored for comparability by staff from the Public Agenda and the Brown Center and numerous sessions were tape-recorded.

Reliability of the Results

A total of 963 adults were interviewed in the panels. As described below, while not a random group, the sample was broadly representative of the adult population in the five cities and, when aggregated, of the national population. Groups of between 178 and 208 adults were convened in five cities: Seattle, Baltimore, Chicago, Nashville, and San Antonio.

The sample is sufficiently large and representative to enable us to generalize about the views of the public as a whole. The sample, which consists of groups in five different regions of the country, is geographically diverse. The sites were also chosen for their diversity in terms of size, urban and rural representativeness and overall demographic composition.

We cannot, of course, specify the sampling error since statistical calculations depend, by definition, upon random sampling. Rather, the data should be understood as reliable but approximate indicators of how a random or probability sample would respond if the same questions were considered under the same circumstances. The sample is large enough to permit detailed analysis of key demographic subgroups. Further, the use of pre- and posttests allows us to measure changes in sentiment and in the intensity of opinion; it allows us to assess which arguments respondents felt were most persuasive and led them to revise their views. In combination with questionnaire results, comments from the discussion sessions allow us to understand why people felt as they did -- that is, to examine the rationale behind reactions to the four futures.

Sample Composition

A quota sample of adult citizens in each of the five sites was drawn by the various interview centers in the five cities using pre-established quotas provided by the Public Agenda that included sex, race, age, income, education, and 1984 voting behavior. To be included in the sample, respondents had to be U.S. citizens and at least 18 years of age. Those who had attended a focus group within the preceding twelve months were ineligible. Recruiting methods varied somewhat among the five firms, but included shopping mall intercepts, telephone solicitation, and callbacks of those who had participated in earlier studies conducted more than six months prior to this study.

The sample is broadly representative of the population of the continental United States in terms of key demographic variables. (See the following pages for a comparison of demographic characteristics of the sample compared to the sample from several recent national surveys using national probability or random samples.)

Additionally, because many variables are related to the demographic characteristics used as strata in this sample, our procedure tended to increase overall representativeness on a variety of important characteristics. For example, the likelihood of someone being underemployed is related to sex, income and education, and the sample was stratified on these latter variables.

Attitudinal and Demographic Comparability:

In addition to demographic comparability, we checked the sample's representativeness by comparing responses through the pretest use of selected items from recent national surveys. In the tables that follow the comparison of the panel's demographics to other recent national surveys, we compare selected panel results to data collected from studies conducted for the Americans Talk Security project by The Daniel Yankelovich Group (March, 1986), Market Opinion Research (January, 1988) and Martilla & Kiley (October, 1987), and to results from the Public Agenda/Brown Center Voter Options study of May, 1984.

Certain variations are due to the use of different kinds of interviews. For example, with telephone or in-person interviews, interviewers are usually instructed to coax respondents to make a choice, thereby minimizing "not sure" responses. That is, when the initial answer is "not sure," interviewers are usually instructed to say something like: "Well, if you had to decide, would you say you 'agree' or 'disagree?'" Since the panel questionnaires were self-administered, we often have a higher percentage of "not sure" responses. Perhaps even more important, the ATS surveys interviewed registered voters whereas the Public Agenda studies in both 1984 and 1988 interviewed eligible voters. In spite of these methodological differences, however, a examination of the panel's responses to results from a variety of national surveys, including ATS, shows substantial comparability.

CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL
WEIGHTED DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARED TO NATIONAL PROBABILITY SAMPLES

RACE

	White	Black/Hisp/Other Nonwhite
	%	%
PANEL SAMPLE	82	18
DYG, 1988	84	15
MOR, 1988	85	15
Martilla & Kiley, 1987	85	15
Gallup, 1986	83	17
PAF/BC, 1984	90	10
Panel (unweighted)	80	20

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

	$15,000/less	$15-$25,000	$25-50,000	$50,000/more
	%	%	%	%
PANEL SAMPLE	20	23	43	14
*DYG, 1988	18	24	42	16
MOR, 1988	19	25	43	13
M & K, 1987	16	24	40	20
Panel (unweighted)	21	24	41	14
	$15,000/less	$15-25,000	$25-40,000	$40,000/more
Gallup, 1986*	32	23	25	21
	$20,000/less	$20-30,000	$30-40,000	$40,000/more
PAF/BC, 1984*	41	30	13	16

* Categories not directly comparable.

CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL
WEIGHTED DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARED TO NATIONAL PROBABILITY SAMPLES (cont)

AGE

	18-29	30-49	50-64	65/+
	%	%	%	%
PANEL SAMPLE	26	39	18	16
DYG, 1988	22	39	21	18
MOR, 1988	22	34	24	19
Martilla & Kiley, 1987	26	40	19	15
Gallup, 1986	22	39	19	19
Panel (unweighted)	28	38	18	16
	18-30	31-45	46-60	60/+
PAF/BC, 1984*	33	23	21	22

EDUCATION

	HS/less	Trade school/ Some college	Coll grad/more
	%	%	%
PANEL SAMPLE	38	36	26
DYG, 1988	47	25	29
MOR, 1988	45	26	28
Martilla & Kiley, 1987	45	26	29
PAF/BC, 1984	50	21	29
Panel (unweighted)	40	34	26
	Some coll/less		Coll grad/more
Gallup, 1986*	79		20

* Categories not directly comparable.

CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL

WEIGHTED DEMOGRAPHICS COMPARED TO NATIONAL PROBABILITY SAMPLES (cont)

	SEX	
	Male	Female
	%	%
PANEL SAMPLE	49	51
DYG, 1988	48	52
MOR, 1988	47	53
Martilla & Kiley, 1987	48	52
Gallup, 1986	50	50
Public Agenda/Brown Center, 1984	50	50
Panel (unweighted)	48	51

SOURCES:

-- Public Agenda Foundation/Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University "U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future," January, 1988. National study among those eligible to vote, N = 963

-- Daniel Yankelovich Group "A Series of Surveys of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," March, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N = 1,004.

-- Market Opinion Research "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," January, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,000.

-- Martilla & Kiley "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," October, 1987. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,002.

-- The Public Agenda Foundation/Brown Center for Foreign Policy Development, Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy, 1984. National telephone survey among those eligible to vote, N= 505.

-- The Gallup Organization, "The Gallup Report No. 255, Political Party Affiliation," December, 1986. In-person survey, N= 1,864.

TREND COMPARISON TABLES

Agree with Statement	ATS#1	Pre	Post
	%	%	%
The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world	38	38	42
Because the Soviet Union will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms	50*	24	24

* October, 1987, before the summit in Washington, D.C.

Agree with Statement	Pre	Post	ATS#2	ATS#3
	%	%	%	%
We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space	55	--	55	51
While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs	--	79	--	84

TREND COMPARISON TABLES, cont.

Agree with Statement	Pre %	Post %	ATS#3 %
We will seriously damage our economy by sepnding too much money to defend other countries	--	74	86
We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both	50	--	59

Agree with Statement	Pre %	Post %	ATS#4 %
We should make our allies (Like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense, even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues[1]	--	78	80
Most likely to lead to nuclear war:[2]			
Terrorist or madman uses nuclear weapon	21	--	35
Soviet surprise strike on U.S. or invasion of Western Europe	15	--	10

1 ATS#4 "...economic and political issues."
2 ATS#4 "If nuclear weapons were ever used... "

Agree with Statement	VO '84 %	Pre %	Post %
If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets they would keep building until they caught up	92	83	--
The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any	82	68	71
There is nothing on earth that could ever justify the all out use of nuclear weapons	79	79	--
We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both	67	50	--
The only language the Soviets understand is force and we have to prove to them that they can't push us around	62	43	--
To guarantee America's security, we must have a nuclear arsenal equal to but not better than the Soviet Union's	57	38	--
The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world	56	38	42
The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia	53	37	41
Because the Soviet Union will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms	45	24	24
When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism	40	26	23
The U.S. should always have more nuclear weapons than the Soviets	39	33	--
The idea that all life on earth could be destroyed in a nuclear war is a wild exaggeration	23	13	--

SOURCES:

-- Martilla & Kiley "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#1, October, 1987. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,002.

-- Market Opinion Research "A Survey of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#2, January, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N= 1,000.

-- Daniel Yankelovich Group "A Series of Surveys of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#3, March, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N = 1,004.

-- Marttila & Kiley "A Series of Surveys of American Voters: Attitudes Concerning National Security Issues," ATS#4, April, 1988. National telephone survey among registered voters, N = 1,004.

-- The Public Agenda Foundation/Brown Center for Foreign Policy Development, Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy, 1984. National telephone survey among those eligible to vote, N= 505.

-- The Public Agenda Foundation/Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University "U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future," January, 1988. National study among those eligible to vote, N = 963

PROJECT STAFF

Executive Committee:

The Hon. Douglas Dillon	Gen. Edward C. Meyer
The Hon. Amos A. Jordan	Dr. Alvin M. Rivlin
The Hon. William J. Hyland	Dr. Howard Swearer
Dr. Walter E. Massey	The Hon. Cyrus Vance
The Hon. David Mathews	The Hon. Thomas J. Watson, Jr.
The Hon. Charles McC. Mathias	Mr. Daniel Yankelovich

At the Public Agenda Foundation:

Research:
John Doble, Vice President
John Immerwahr, Research Fellow
Judith Kallick, Research Associate
Cheryl Koopman, Research Fellow
Stephen Immerwahr, Research Associate

Public Summit '88 Campaign:
Kate Sheaffer, Campaign Director
Kim Edmonds, Media Director
Leslie Jaynes, Administrative Assistant
Rayne Pollock, Administrative Assistant
Jeff Allen, Administrative Assistant
Sonia Krotkov, Administrative Assistant

Videotapes for Public Summit '88:
Jeffrey Tuchman, Executive Producer
Julie Lewis, Associate Producer
Liza Zumwalt, Production Manager

Administration:
Herbert A. (Tony) Wagner, Project Director: The Public, the Soviets, and Nuclear Arms
Deborah Wadsworth, Executive Director
Jean Johnson, Director of Programs
Robert Kingston, Senior Advisor
Sarah Hamilton, Assistant to Director of Programs

PROJECT STAFF

At the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University:

Administration:
Mark Garrison, Director
Jan Kalicki, Executive Director
Richard Smoke, Research Director

Research Staff:
Karl Berger
Kurt Campbell
Kenneth J, Coughlin
J.Terry Emerson
Dietrich Fischer
Elizabeth Hatch
Matthew Hirsch
Mark Lindeman
Sarah McClurg
Douglas Seay
Alan B. Sherr
Eric Stubbs

Administrative Staff:
Betty Garrison, Administrator
Phyllis Allsworth
Shelia Fournier
Linda Gomes
Barbra LeFort
John Lew
Michael Schrader

Others at Brown University:
Abbot Gleason, Research Associate (Professor of History)
Jo-Anne Hart, Research Associate (Asst. Professor of Political Science)
Eric Nordlinger, Research Associate, (Professor of Political Science)
P. Terrence Hopman, Research Associate (Professor of Political Science)

Research Assistants:
Antonio Anguita
Leslie Batchelor
Aaron Belkin
Lisa Flaxman
Diana Ganz
Ted Hirsch
Dwight Holton
Joan Maudlin
Jeffrey May
Jeanne McKenna
Alma Prins
Kristen Rodine
Graham Schwass
Michael Song
Robert Wheelersberg
Matthew Yeo

PROJECT STAFF

City Coordinators for Public Summit '88

Paul Castillo, San Antonio City Coordinator
Harriet Hall, Nashville City Coordinator
John Hoyt, Seattle City Coordinator
Craig Livingstone, Baltimore City Coordinator

Public Summit 88 Media Cosponsors:

Baltimore:	The Evening Sun, Times Mirror Co. WJZ TV, ABC Affilate, Westinghouse Broadcasting
Nashville:	The Tennessean, Gannet Co. SMV TV, NBC Affiliate, Gillette Broadcasing
San Antonio:	Express-News, The Express-News Corporation KENS TV, KENS II, CBS Affiliate, Harte-Hanks Communications
Seattle:	Seattle Post-Intelligencer, The Hearst Corporation KIRO TV, KIRO Radio, CBS Affiliate, KIRO, Inc

Panel Moderators:

John Carvalho, Villanova University/HOSI
Joseph DesJardins, Villanova University/HOSI
John Doody, Villanova University/HOSI
John Fielder, Villanova University/HOSI
John McCall, St. Joseph's College/HOSI
Edward Sullivan, Villanova University/HOSI
John Immerwahr, the Public Agenda and Villanova University/HOSI
Judith Kallick, Cheryl Koopman and John Doble, the Public Agenda

Moderator Training:
The Human Organization Sciences Institute at Villanova University and Richard Smoke, John Immerwahr and John Doble

Sampling and Recruiting:
A & H Interviewing, Baltimore, Maryland
Nashville Research Group, Nashville, Tennessee
L.T. Gibson and Associates, San Antonio, Texas
AIS, Bellevue, Washington
Illinois Center Market Research, Chicago, Illinois
under the direction of Judith Kallick

Data Processing:
CRC Information Systems, Inc., NYC.

V. QUESTIONAIRES AND HANDOUTS

12/29/87
The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 686-6610
Questionnaire #1: Pretest

Center for Foreign Policy Developement
Brown University
P.O. Box 1948
Providence, R.I. 02912
(401) 863-3465

INTERVIEW # -- DO NOT FILL IN

_1_ -1 ___ -2 ___-3 ___-4

PLEASE BEGIN HERE

INSTRUCTIONS: Go though the questionnaire and answer each question. Circle the number of your answer.

What is your name? ______________________________
PRINT YOUR FULL NAME ON THE LINE ABOVE

1. Where do you live? (Circle the number across from your state)

a. Washington	5	-1
b. Maryland		-2
c. Illinois		-3
d. Texas		-4
e. Tennessee		-5

People have different ideas about what our relationship with the Soviet Union should be like in the year 2010. Keeping in mind what you think is possible along with what you'd like the country to do, consider these four alternative visions of what the U.S. should try to achieve by the year 2010. Indicate how you feel about each of them.

2. FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.

Strongly favor.....................6 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

3. FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.

Strongly favor.....................7 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

4. FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

Strongly favor.....................8 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

5. FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.

Strongly favor.....................9 -1
Somewhat favor..................... -2
Somewhat oppose.................... -3
Strongly oppose.................... -4
Not sure........................... -5

Here are some possible policies this country could follow in the next few years. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
6. We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars")...........10	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
7. We should provide aid to anticommunist groups and governments..11	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
8. We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries..12	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
9. We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments....................13	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
10. We should recognize and establish trade relations with Cuba.............14	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
11. We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically..................15	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
12. We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights.............16	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
13. We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism..........17	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
14. We and the Soviets should work together on a joint, manned mission to the planet Mars....................18	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
15. We should make our allies (like Japan and West Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense............19	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
16. We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war.................................20	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
17. We should increase our nonnuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches the level of the Soviet Union.............21	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
18. We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America....................22	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is.

Possible Threats	Very Likely	Fairly Likely	Not that Likely	Not Sure
19. The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan.............23	-1	-2	-3	-4
20. Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S......................24	-1	-2	-3	-4
21. The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war.............25	-1	-2	-3	-4
22. We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries.......................................26	-1	-2	-3	-4
23. We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position.....27	-1	-2	-3	-4
24. Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons................................28	-1	-2	-3	-4
25. A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war...................29	-1	-2	-3	-4

Possible Threats	Very Likely	Fairly Likely	Not that Likely	Not Sure
26. The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam...........30	-1	-2	3	-4
27. Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world..................31	-1	-2	-3	-4
28. The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Libya and terrorist groups in the Middle East..................................32	-1	-2	-3	-4
29. A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons...33	-1	-2	-3	-4
30. Poor communications will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war..34	-1	-2	-3	-4
31. We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race..........................35	-1	-2	-3	-4
32. A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer......................36	-1	-2	-3	-4

Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union.

Statement	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
33. The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world..................37	-1	-2	-3
34. Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do..............................38	-1	-2	-3
35. No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal..39	-1	-2	-3
36. The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S..40	-1	-2	-3
37. While the leaders of the Soviet Union may be ruthless, they are not reckless or irrational fanatics..41	-1	-2	-3
38. The Soviets will cheat on any nuclear arms agreement they sign...............................42	-1	-2	-3
39. We will never be safe without a clear, decisive military edge over the Soviet Union........43	-1	-2	-3
40. We're so concerned about our military rival, the Soviet Union, that we are losing to our economic rivals such as Japan and Germany...........44	-1	-2	-3
41. Working with the Soviets to solve common problems would be a serious mistake because they would take advantage of us and steal our high technology....................................45	-1	-2	-3
42. The new Soviet leaders are ready to "do business" with us just like the Chinese were in the 1970s..................................46	-1	-2	-3

43. Which of these statements comes closer to your own view?

STATEMENT A: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would use their increased wealth to stir up trouble by funding communist revolutionaries around the world.

OR

STATEMENT B: If the Soviet Union became better off economically, they would become less of a threat because they would have more to lose in conflict.

1. Statement A is closer to my view.......47 -1
2. Statement B is closer to my view....... -2
3. Not sure.............................. -3

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

		Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
44. The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any..............................	48	-1	-2	-3
45. We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours; there's room in the world for both..................................	49	-1	-2	-3
46. The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world................	50	-1	-2	-3
47. The U.S. often blames the Soviet Union for troubles in other countries that are really caused by poverty, hunger, political corruption and repression..	51	-1	-2	-3
48. Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms..........................	52	-1	-2	-3
49. The only language the Soviets understand is force, and we have to prove to them that they can't push us around......................................	53	-1	-2	-3
50. The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia..	54	-1	-2	-3
51. When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism.....	55	-1	-2	-3
52. If we had a bigger nuclear arsenal than the Soviets, they would keep building until they caught up..	56	-1	-2	-3
53. The idea that all life on earth could be destroyed in a nuclear war is a wild exaggeration....	57	-1	-2	-3
54. To guarantee America's security, we must have a nuclear arsenal equal to but not better than the Soviet Union's.....................................	58	-1	-2	-3
55. The U.S. should always have more nuclear weapons than the Soviets............................	59	-1	-2	-3
56. There is nothing on earth that could ever justify the all out use of nuclear weapons...........	60	-1	-2	-3

57. Experts feel that there are different ways in which a nuclear war might start. Consider each of the following and indicate which one you think is most likely to lead to nuclear war? Mark only one answer.

		The Most Likely Way A Nuclear War Will Start Is: (MARK ONLY ONE ANSWER)
a. The Soviets will invade Europe or launch a surprise attack with nuclear weapons against the U.S.	61	-1
OR		
b. A war in the Third World (for example, in the Middle East) will escalate and draw in the superpowers		-2
OR		
c. Terrorists or a mad man will use a nuclear weapon		-3
OR		
d. A nuclear weapon will be launched by accident		-4

58. Imagine that history were changed and the Soviet Union, not the United States, invented the atomic bomb. Imagine that the Soviet Union used A-bombs on Japan to end the World War II, and that they were the only country in the world with atomic (or nuclear) weapons from 1945 until about 1955. If history were different, what do you think would have happened?

A. Sometime between 1945 and 1955, the Soviets would have attacked the U.S. with atomic bombs between, thereby defeating their strongest enemy.

OR

B. The Soviets would have tried to intimidate the U.S. by threatening to use atomic bombs, but they would never have actually exploded any; their goal is to take over the U.S., not blow it up.

OR

C. The Soviets would have used atomic weapons only to defend themselves and their allies.

(MARK ONLY ONE ANSWER)

A is probably what would have happened	62	-1
B is probably what would have happened		-2
C is probably what would have happened		-3
Not sure		-4

59. First, generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, and Independent, or something else? (If you are an Independent, do you consider yourself closer to being an Republican or a Democrat?)

Republican	63	-1
Democrat		-2
Independent-Democrat		-3
Independent-Republican		-4
Completely Independent		-5
Other		-6
Not sure		-7
I'd rather not answer		-8

60. When it comes to political issues, do you think of yourself as a liberal, a conservative, or a moderate?

Liberal	64	-1
Liberal to Moderate		-2
Moderate		-3
Moderate to Conservative		-4
Conservative		-5
Not sure		-6
I'd rather not answer		-7

61. What is your age?

Under 25	65	-1
25 to 29		-2
30 to 39		-3
40 to 49		-4
50 to 64		-5
65 and over		-6
I'd rather not answer		-7

62. Are you presently married, divorced, widowed, separated, or have you never been married?

Married	66	-1
Divorced		-2
Widowed		-3
Separated		-4
Never been married		-5
I'd rather not answer		-6

63. Do you have any children? Are any of them under 18 years of age?

Yes, my children are under 18	67	-1
Yes, my children are over 18		-2
Yes, I have children who are over and under 18		-3
No children		-4
I'd rather not answer		-5

64. What was the last grade of school you completed?

Grade school or less	68	-1
Some high school (9-11)		-2
High school grad		-3
Vocational/technical		-4
Some college/2 yr. college		-5
Four yr. college grad		-6
Post-graduate work		-7
I'd rather not answer		-8

65. Are you currently employed and working full-time, employed and working part-time, unemployed, retired, or at home?

Employed full-time	69	-1
Employed part-time		-2
Unemployed		-3
Retired		-4
At home		-5
Student		-6
Laid-off		-7
I'd rather not answer		-8

66. Is you religious background Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (If not one of these, do you consider your religious background Christian or non-Christian?)

Protestant..........................	70	-1
Catholic............................		-2
Jewish..............................		-3
Other Christian.....................		-4
Other non-Christian.................		-5
None/I'd rather not answer..........		-6

67. Are you white, black, Hispanic, Asian, or Oriental, or something else?

White...............................	71	-1
Black...............................		-2
Hispanic............................		-3
Asian/Oriental......................		-4
Other...............................		-5
I'd rather not answer...............		-6

68. For tabulation purposes only, please indicate which of the following income categories includes your total family income in 1987 before taxes.

Less than $15,000...................	72	-1
$15,000 to $24,999..................		-2
$25,000 to $34,999..................		-3
$35,000 to $49,999..................		-4
$50,000 to $74,999..................		-5
$75,000 or over.....................		-6
I'd rather not answer...............		-7

69. Please indicate your gender:

Male................................	73	-1
Female..............................		-2

THAT ENDS THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE KEEP IT UNTIL YOU'RE ASKED TO HAND IT IN.

Cols. 74 - 80 left blank

The Public Agenda Foundation
6 East 39th Street
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 686-6610
Questionnaire #2: Posttest

Center for Foreign Policy Development
Brown University
P.O. Box 1948
Providence, R.I. 02912
(401) 863-3465

INTERVIEW # -- DO NOT FILL IN

2 -1 ___ -2 ___-3 ___-4

PLEASE BEGIN HERE

INSTRUCTIONS: Go through the questionnaire and again answer each question. Many questions are the same as the ones you answered earlier. We're asking them again to see how, if at all, your views changed after seeing the films and discussing the issues. As before, just circle the number of your answer.

What is your name? ______________________________
PRINT YOUR FULL NAME ON THE LINE ABOVE

1. Where do you live? (Circle the number across from your state)

a. Washington........................5 -1
b. Maryland.......................... -2
c. Illinois.......................... -3
d. Texas............................. -4
e. Tennessee......................... -5

Everyone agrees that the future depends on how we as a nation face the threats to our nation's security. But not everyone agrees on what those threats are, or how menacing they are. Listed below are some of the threats confronting our nation. Mark how likely you think each one is.

Possible Threats		Very Likely	Fairly Likely	Not that Likely	Not Sure
2. The Soviet Union will attack other nations in the way they invaded Afghanistan................	6	-1	-2	-3	-4
3. Sooner or later, the Soviet Union will launch an all out, surprise attack with nuclear weapons on the U.S..	7	-1	-2	-3	-4
4. The arms race with the Soviet Union will, sooner or later, lead to nuclear war...............	8	-1	-2	-3	-4
5. We will seriously damage our economy by spending too much money to defend other countries..	9	-1	-2	-3	-4
6. We will sign an arms control agreement that will leave us in a weak or inferior position......	10	-1	-2	-3	-4
7. Mistrust and hostility will keep us from working with the Soviets on the real problems facing us like terrorism and the spread of nuclear weapons.................................	11	-1	-2	-3	-4
8. A regional war (like in the Middle East) will escalate into all-out war....................	12	-1	-2	-3	-4
9. The U.S. will act as the "world's policeman" and get bogged down in another Vietnam............	13	-1	-2	-3	-4
10. Marxism/communism will spread to more and more countries around the world..................	14	-1	-2	-3	-4
11. The Soviets will increase their support of countries like Libya and terrorist groups in the Middle East.................................	15	-1	-2	-3	-4
12. A smaller country such as Pakistan, Israel or South Africa will eventually use nuclear weapons..	16	-1	-2	-3	-4
13. Poor communications will cause a conflict or incident (like the downing of the Korean airliner) to become a crisis that threatens war...	17	-1	-2	-3	-4
14. We will neglect problems here in the U.S. because we spend so much on what seems like a never-ending arms race...........................	18	-1	-2	-3	-4
15. A nuclear weapon will be launched accidentally, by a computer......................	19	-1	-2	-3	-4

Mark if you agree or disagree with these statements about the Soviet Union.

Statement		Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
16. The Soviets truly want to work with us to solve common problems, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries around the world	20	-1	-2	-3
17. Though they may never be our friends, the Soviets want to reduce the danger of nuclear war just as much as we do	21	-1	-2	-3
18. No matter what they say, the Soviets really want every country in the world to be communist and they will never stop trying to reach that goal	22	-1	-2	-3
19. The Soviets have so many problems of their own and they don't really pose much of a threat to the U.S	23	-1	-2	-3

Here are some proposals for policies this country could follow. Bearing in mind what you want in the future, indicate how you feel about each one.

		Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
20. We should build a system of defensive weapons in outer space (called SDI or "Star Wars"), even if that means giving up the chance to negotiate deep cuts in nuclear arms with the Soviets	24	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
21. We should aid anticommunist groups and governments in the Third World, even if that means sometimes supporting dictators and others who do not believe in democracy	25	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
22. We should work with the Soviets to solve problems facing both countries, even if the only way to gain their trust is by sharing or not building SDI or Star Wars	26	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
23. We should bring our troops home from overseas and gradually end our treaty commitments, even if that means our allies might make concessions to the Soviets	27	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
24. We should recognize Cuba and establish trade relations, even if that means strengthening and legitimizing a communist government in this hemisphere	28	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
25. We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means leaving them with the largest army in the world	29	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

	Strongly Favor	Somewhat Favor	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Not Sure
26. We should refuse to work with the Soviets until they show greater respect for human rights, even if that means not signing any arms control agreement.....................30	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
27. We should provide increased military aid to Third World countries to help them fight communism, even if that means increasing the chance that U.S. troops will get involved in local fighting.............................31	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
28. We and the Soviets should work together on a joint manned mission to the planet Mars, even if that means sharing our high technology...........32	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
29. We should make our allies (like Japan and Germany) pay more of the cost of their defense even if that means losing our influence over them on economic issues....................33	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
30. We should negotiate agreements with the Soviets to prevent regional crises from escalating into global war, even if that means doing things that our allies such as Israel oppose......34	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
31. We should reach an agreement with the Soviets to cut both sides' nuclear arsenals drastically, even if that means increasing our nonnuclear, conventional military strength (army, navy, etc.) so that it matches their's.............................35	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5
32. We should stop defending countries around the world and defend only North America even if that means we might eventually be surrounded by enemies...36	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure
33. The Soviets are constantly testing us, probing for weakness, and they're quick to take advantage whenever they find any..............................37	-1	-2	-3
34. We should live and let live; let the communists have their system and we have ours, there's room in the world for both.................................38	-1	-2	-3
35. The Soviet Union is like Hitler's Germany -- an evil empire trying to rule the world.................39	-1	-2	-3
36. Because the Soviets will not keep their end of the bargain, we should not sign any agreements with them limiting nuclear arms...........................40	-1	-2	-3
37. The U.S. would be safer if we stopped trying to prevent the spread of communism and learned to live with them the way we live with China and Yugoslavia..41	-1	-2	-3
38. When all is said and done, someday the U.S. will have to fight the Soviet Union to stop communism.....42	-1	-2	-3

39. How do you feel about the following? A major American auto company is considering a joint venture to make cars in the Soviet Union. Those in favor say this would help an American company compete with the Japanese in the world market. But those opposed say this kind of an arrangement would make the Soviets stronger and thus more of a threat in the long run. How do you feel? Do you favor or oppose an American company making cars in the Soviet Union to sell on the world market?

Favor......................	43	-1
Oppose......................		-2
Not sure....................		-3

Here are some arguments for and against Future One, THE U.S. GAINS THE UPPER HAND: Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

		A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
PRO ARGUMENTS				
40. We can gain the upper hand because we are wealthier than the Soviets and we have the edge in high technology..............................	44	-1	-2	-3
41. The success of the Grenada invasion proves that we can and should try to stop communist expansion..	45	-1	-2	-3
42. The U.S. has an obligation to oppose Soviet and communist expansion and defend freedom around the world.................................	46	-1	-2	-3
43. We are already in a winner-take-all competition with the Soviets and, realistically speaking, this is the only way to keep them at bay..............	47	-1	-2	-3
CON ARGUMENTS				
44. Trying to gain military superiority is a formula for an endless arms race..................	48	-1	-2	-3
45. Trying to stop communist expansion around the world will only lead us into more Vietnams........	49	-1	-2	-3
46. This Future would be too expensive because it would mean enormous defense spending, year after year...	50	-1	-2	-3
47. This Future would be too dangerous because the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat........	51	-1	-2	-3

48. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand. Regain clear superiority over the Soviets in military matters and world affairs.

PRO: History proves that strength is the only thing the Russians respect.
CON: Risky: will make the Soviets feel as if they are backed into a corner.

Strongly favor......................	52	-1
Somewhat favor......................		-2
Somewhat oppose.....................		-3
Strongly oppose.....................		-4
Not sure............................		-5

Here are some arguments for and against Future Two, ELIMINATE THE NUCLEAR THREAT; COMPETE OTHERWISE: Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
PRO ARGUMENTS			
49. We should drastically cut the number of nuclear weapons on both sides so that, if somehow they are ever used, the whole world won't be destroyed......53	-1	-2	-3
50. Under their new leader, the Soviets will allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat.54	-1	-2	-3
51. We and the Soviets should reach agreements to prevent local conflicts, such as in the Middle East, from escalating because they are the major way that a nuclear war could start.................55	-1	-2	-3
52. Eliminating the nuclear threat will enable us to oppose communist expansion in the Third World with less risk...................................56	-1	-2	-3
CON ARGUMENTS			
53. The Soviets can't be trusted and will cheat on arms control treaties..........................57	-1	-2	-3
54. We should not reach agreements to end the arms race because nuclear weapons have kept the peace since World War II.................................58	-1	-2	-3
55. This Future would leave the Soviets with a large advantage in nonnuclear (conventional) forces such as tanks and soldiers..................59	-1	-2	-3
56. It's just not realistic to think that we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while, at the same time, cooperate with them to eliminate the risk of nuclear war...........................60	-1	-2	-3

57. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat: Compete Otherwise. Reach agreements with the Soviets to end the arms race and prevent local conflicts, such as those in the Middle East, from posing a nuclear threat; at the same time, fight communist expansion in the Third World.

PRO: The way things are going now, it's only a matter of time before there is a nuclear war.
CON: The Soviets can't be trusted to keep such agreements.

Strongly favor.....................61 -1
Somewhat favor...................... -2
Somewhat oppose..................... -3
Strongly oppose..................... -4
Not sure............................ -5

Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOVLING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

PRO ARGUMENTS	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
58. The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution, and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets....62	-1	-2	-3
59. A basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race..............................63	-1	-2	-3
60. The Soviets seem willing to go down this path..64	-1	-2	-3
61. Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe...65	-1	-2	-3
CON ARGUMENTS			
62. This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner..........66	-1	-2	-3
63. This Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge.............67	-1	-2	-3
64. This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI, and giving up the idea of gaining clear military superiority...............................68	-1	-2	-3
65. The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, then turn on us as they've done in the past........69	-1	-2	-3

66. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us.

Strongly favor......................70	-1
Somewhat favor......................	-2
Somewhat oppose......................	-3
Strongly oppose......................	-4
Not sure............................	-5

Here are some arguments for and against Future Three, COOPERATIVE PROBLEM SOVLING: Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

PRO ARGUMENTS	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
58. The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution, and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets....62	-1	-2	-3
59. A basic change in the U.S.-Soviet relationship that improves trust is the only way we'll be able to end the arms race..............................63	-1	-2	-3
60. The Soviets seem willing to go down this path..64	-1	-2	-3
61. Unless we change our relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe...65	-1	-2	-3
CON ARGUMENTS			
62. This Future would mean giving up the fight against communist expansion around the world and accepting a ruthless dictatorship as an equal partner..........66	-1	-2	-3
63. This Future would require us sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge.............67	-1	-2	-3
64. This Future would mean sharing or not building SDI, and giving up the idea of gaining clear military superiority..............................68	-1	-2	-3
65. The Soviets will trick us, pretend to cooperate, then turn on us as they've done in the past........69	-1	-2	-3

66. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving. Make agreements with the Soviets on problems facing both nations, such as threats to the environment and the spread of nuclear weapons to nations around the world.

PRO: These problems are a danger to both nations, and this course is the best way to build trust.
CON: The Soviets will use this opportunity to take advantage of us.

Strongly favor......................70 -1
Somewhat favor...................... -2
Somewhat oppose..................... -3
Strongly oppose..................... -4
Not sure............................ -5

Here are some arguments for and against Future Four, DEFEND ONLY NORTH AMERICA: Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves. Indicate whether you think each argument is convincing or not.

	A Convincing Argument	Not Convincing	Not Sure
PRO ARGUMENTS			
67. Our allies are perfectly capable of defending themselves and they can afford it..................71	-1	-2	-3
68. Especially in view of our problems here in the U.S., we can't afford to defend so many nations....72	-1	-2	-3
69. Being the "world's policeman" increases our chances of getting dragged into a nuclear war......73	-1	-2	-3
70. While we spend billions to defend Japan and Europe, they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs...............................74	-1	-2	-3
CON ARGUMENTS			
71. Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and eventually leave us alone in a world filled with enemies..75	-1	-2	-3
72. We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world.................................76	-1	-2	-3
73. History shows that it is U.S. strength that keeps ruthless, aggressive countries from starting trouble around the world..........................77	-1	-2	-3
74. If we pull back, many nations would feel more insecure and would build their own nuclear weapons...78	-1	-2	-3

75. Keeping in mind the PRO and CON arguments, indicate how you feel about FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America. Bring our troops home, gradually ending our treaty commitments and letting our allies take care of themselves.

PRO: We will be able to concentrate on our own problems here in the U.S.
CON: If we pull back, we will have to stand alone in a hostile world.

Strongly favor.....................79	-1
Somewhat favor......................	-2
Somewhat oppose.....................	-3
Strongly oppose.....................	-4
Not sure............................	-5

Col. 80 left blank
End of Card One

Rank the four Futures in the order you favor them. Rank them by giving a "1" to the Future you favor most, a "2" to your second choice, a "3" to your third choice, and a "4" to the Future you favor least.

		1 to 4 Ranking
76. FUTURE ONE: The U.S. Gains the Upper Hand.......................	5	____
77. FUTURE TWO: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat: Compete Otherwise.....	6	____
78. FUTURE THREE: Cooperative Problem Solving.......................	7	____
79. FUTURE FOUR: Defend Only North America..........................	8	____

Is there any Future that you favor but did not select because you think it's not possible to achieve?

80. I like FUTURE ONE but think it's not possible...........9 -1
81. I like FUTURE TWO but think it's not possible...........10 -1
82. I like FUTURE THREE but think it's not possible.........11 -1
83. I like FUTURE FOUR but think it's not possible..........12 -1
84. I did not oppose any Future because it's not possible...13 -1

85. Regardless of which Future you prefer, which one do you think is most likely to occur by the year 2010.

FUTURE ONE is most likely..............14 -1
FUTURE TWO is most likely............... -2
FUTURE THREE is most likely............. -3
FUTURE FOUR is most likely.............. -4
Not sure................................ -5

86. How would you compare the presentation of the information tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more thought-provoking, less thought-provoking, or about the same?

More thought-provoking than TV and newspaper...............15 -1
Less thought-provoking than TV and newspaper................ -2
About the same.. -3
Not sure.. -4

87. How would you compare the presentation tonight to what you normally get through TV news and in the newspaper. Would you say the presentation tonight was more understandable, less understandable, or about the same?

More understandable than TV and newspaper..................16 -1
Less understandable than TV and newspaper................... -2
About the same.. -3
Not sure.. -4

88. Did you change your mind about any aspects of this issue or think about the issue in ways that you had not previously considered?

Yes.................................17 -1 -- Please elaborate below
No.................................. -2
Not sure............................ -3

89. What did you change your mind about or think about differently? ____________

____

____ 18-19

90. Have you heard of Public Summit 88?
Yes................................20 -1 -- Please elaborate below
No................................. -2
Not sure........................... -3

91. What have you heard? ____

____

____21-22

These last few questions are only for tabulation purposes and are strictly confidential.

92. First, generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else? (If you are an Independent, do you consider yourself closer to being a Republican or a Democrat?)

Republican.........................23 -1
Democrat........................... -2
Independent-Democrat............... -3
Independent-Republican............. -4
Completely Independent............. -5
Other.............................. -6
Not sure........................... -7
I'd rather not answer.............. -8

93. When it comes to political issues, do you think of yourself as a liberal, a conservative, or a moderate?

Liberal............................24 -1
Moderate to Liberal................ -2
Moderate........................... -3
Moderate to Conservative........... -4
Conservative....................... -5
Not sure........................... -6
I'd rather not answer.............. -7

94. What is your age?

Under 25...........................25 -1
25 to 29........................... -2
30 to 39........................... -3
40 to 49........................... -4
50 to 64........................... -5
65 and over........................ -6
I'd rather not answer.............. -7

95. Are you presently married, divorced, widowed, separated, or have you never been married?

Married............................26 -1
Divorced........................... -2
Widowed............................ -3
Separated.......................... -4
Never been married................. -5
I'd rather not answer.............. -6

96. Do you have any children? Are any of them under 18 years of age?

Yes, my children are under 18.....................27 -1
Yes, my children are over 18...................... -2
Yes, I have children who are over and under 18..... -3
No children....................................... -4
I'd rather not answer............................. -5

97. What was the last grade of school you completed?

Grade school or less................	28	-1
Some high school (9-11).............		-2
High school graduate................		-3
Vocational/technical................		-4
Some college/2 yr. college..........		-5
Four yr. college graduate...........		-6
Post-graduate work..................		-7
I'd rather not answer...............		-8

98. Are you currently employed and working full-time, employed and working part-time, unemployed, retired, or at home?

Employed full-time..................	29	-1
Employed part-time..................		-2
Unemployed..........................		-3
Retired.............................		-4
At home.............................		-5
Student.............................		-6
Laid-off............................		-7
I'd rather not answer...............		-8

99. Is you religious background Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or something else? (If not one of these, do you consider your religious background Christian or non-Christian?)

Protestant..........................	30	-1
Catholic............................		-2
Jewish..............................		-3
Other Christian.....................		-4
Other non-Christian.................		-5
None/I'd rather not answer..........		-6

100. Are you white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Oriental, or something else?

White...............................	31	-1
Black...............................		-2
Hispanic............................		-3
Asian/Oriental......................		-4
Other...............................		-5
I'd rather not answer...............		-6

101. For tabulation purposes only, please indicate which of the following income categories includes your total family income in 1987 before taxes.

Less than $15,000...................	32	-1
$15,000 to $24,999..................		-2
$25,000 to $34,999..................		-3
$35,000 [illegible] $49,999..................		-4
$50,000 to $74,999..................		-5
$75,000 or over.....................		-6
I'd rather not answer...............		-7

102. Please indicate your gender:

Male................................	33	-1
Female..............................		-2

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP. THAT COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
PLEASE KEEP IT UNITL YOU ARE ASKED TO HAND IT IN.

Cols. 34 - 80 left blank
End of Second Card

Future One: America Gains the Upper Hand

By 2010 the U.S. will have achieved military and political superiority over the Soviet Union. We will have realized that the Soviets, no matter what they pretend, aim to dominate the world. So we will have developed advanced nuclear and other weapons, probably including a "Star Wars" defense against missiles. And we will be vigorously opposing Marxism in the Third World.

Arguments FOR this future:

-- Possible because we are wealthier and have an edge in high technology.
-- Grenada proves that we can stop communist expansion.
-- We have an obligation to oppose Soviet/communist expansion and defend freedom.
-- We are already in a winner-take-all competition and, realistically, this is the only way to keep the Soviets at bay.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

-- A formula for an endless arms race.
-- Trying to stop communism will lead to more Vietnams.
-- Too expensive, would mean enormous defense spending, year after year.
-- Too dangerous, the Soviets might feel like a cornered rat.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

The greatest danger we face is Soviet aggression.

Future Two: Eliminate the Nuclear Threat; Compete Otherwise

By 2010 we and the Soviets will have taken far-reaching steps to make sure a global holocaust is impossible. Nearly all nuclear weapons will be scrapped, with strict safeguards against Soviet cheating. And the two sides will have taken steps to prevent any crisis (for instance in the Middle East) from escalating into a global war. But despite the agreement on nuclear arms, both sides continue to compete for world influence, and both seek to gain supporters in the Third World.

Arguments FOR this future:

-- If nuclear weapons are ever used, at least the world won't be destroyed.
-- The Soviets now allow on-site inspection and so we'll know if they cheat.
-- Local conflicts that escalate are how a nuclear war could start.
-- We'll be able to strongly oppose communist expansion with less risk.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

-- The Soviets will cheat on arms control treaties.
-- The fear of nuclear weapons has kept the peace since World War II.
-- The Soviets will have more nonnuclear or conventional forces (tanks and soldiers).
-- It's not realistic to think we can compete with the Soviets in the Third World while cooperating with them on nuclear arms.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

The greatest danger we face is global nuclear war.

Future Three: Cooperative Problem-Solving

By 2010 the U.S. and the Soviet Union will have changed their whole relationship, much as the U.S. and China did in the 1970s. The two sides are now cooperating on problems that face them both, such as terrorism, the spread of nuclear weapons, and dangers to the environment. The two sides have built up trust, which allows them to work now on the tougher problem of nuclear weapons. Building up trust has not been done on U.S. terms; both sides have made compromises.

Arguments FOR this future:

-- The spread of nuclear weapons, pollution, and AIDS are the real problems facing us and the Soviets.

-- Improving trust is the only way to end the arms race.

-- They seem willing to go down this path.

-- Unless we change the relationship, even the most comprehensive arms agreements won't make us safe.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

-- Would mean ending the fight against communist expansion and accepting a dictatorship as our partner.

-- Would require sharing our high technology and giving up our main edge.

-- Would mean sharing or not building SDI, and never gaining clear military superiority.

-- The Soviets will pretend to cooperate, then turn on us.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

The greatest danger we face is the hostility between the two sides.

Future Four: Defend Only North America

By 2010 we will have recognized that the main challenge we face is not the Soviets but problems here at home. We will have phased out our alliances in Europe and Asia, and brought home our troops. Now the U.S. maintains a strong defense of North America, probably including a ("Star Wars") defense against missiles. Otherwise we are concentrating on our own affairs. What the Soviets do or don't do is not a major concern.

Arguments FOR this future:

-- Our allies are capable of defending themselves.
-- We can't afford to defend so many nations.
-- Being the "world's policeman" increases the chances of nuclear war.
-- We spend billions to defend Japan and Europe while they are winning the economic competition and taking away American jobs.

Arguments AGAINST this future:

-- Our allies may make concessions to the Soviets and leave us alone in a world filled with enemies.
-- We have a moral obligation to defend freedom around the world.
-- History shows that our strength keeps other countries from starting trouble.
-- Other nations will feel the need to build their own nuclear weapons.

The BASIC PERSPECTIVE here:

The greatest danger we face is being involved in other people's affairs all around the world.

Policies for the next few years

FUTURE 1

- Build up nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, to a level superior to the Soviets.
- Rapidly develop, and begin to deploy, SDI ("Star Wars")
- Strongly aid freedom fighters combatting Communism in the Third World. (Examples: Nicaragua, Africa, Afghanistan, Grenada)

FUTURE 2

- Negotiate drastic cuts in nuclear weapons, working in stages toward removing them almost entirely. Agreements must include strict verification
- Negotiate agreements to prevent escalation of regional crises into global war.
- Support anti-Communist freedom fighters in the Third World ONLY where there is no risk of a crisis with the Soviets. (Examples: Afghanistan, Grenada)

FUTURE 3

- Begin working with the Soviets on common problems: AIDS, terrorism, the spread of nuclear weapons, pollution and other environmental dangers.
- As greater trust is built up this way, use that trust to attack the tougher problem of nuclear weapons.
- Treat Communist Third World nations pragmatically, not ideologically. (Example: open trade with Cuba.)

FUTURE 4

- Tell the West Europeans, Japanese and other allies that we will phase out our alliances on a set schedule.
- Begin to bring our troops home from abroad. All of them will be home in, say, ten years.
- Rapidly develop, and begin to deploy, SDI ("Star Wars") if it proves effective.

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Harold M. Agnew
Former Chief Executive Officer, GA Technologies
Member, White House Science Council

Professor Madeleine Albright
School of Foreign Service
Georgetown University

Dr. Lew Allen, Jr.
Director, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology

Professor Graham T. Allison
Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Vice Admiral John A. Baldwin
President, Naval War College

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago

Professor Seweryn Bialer
Director, Research Institute on International Change
Columbia University

Dr. Ernest Boyer
Former U.S. Commissioner of Education
President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Mr. Lawrence E. Bruce, Jr.
President, U.S. Committee for UNICEF

Professor McGeorge Bundy
Former Special Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
Department of History, New York University

Mr. Willard C. Butcher
Chairman, The Chase Manhattan Bank

National Council

Mr. Louis W. Cabot
Chairman, Cabot Corporation

Mr. Philip Caldwell
Senior Managing Director, Shearson Lehman Brothers

Ms. Antonia Handler Chayes
Former Under Secretary of the Air Force
Chairman, Endispute

The Honorable Warren Christopher
Former Deputy Secretary of State
O'Melveny and Myers

The Honorable Henry Cisneros
Mayor of San Antonio

The Honorable Harlan Cleveland
Former U.S. Ambassador to NATO
Dean, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

The Honorable Clark M. Clifford
Former Secretary of Defense
Clifford and Warnke

The Honorable William Colby
Former Director of Central Intelligence
Colby, Bailey, and Associates

The Honorable Martha Layne Collins
Governor of the State of Kentucky

Mr. Edward H. Crane
President, Cato Institute

Ms. Mary Dent Crisp
Former Co-Chair, Republican National Committee
Senior Advisor, Business Executives for National Security

Dr. Lynn E. Davis
Former Deputy to the Under Secretary of Defense
Director of Studies, International Institute
for Strategic Studies

National Council

Mr. William M. Detweiler
Chairman, Foreign Relations Commission
The American Legion

*The Honorable Douglas Dillon
Former Secretary of the Treasury
Brunt & Company

Ms. Mary Anne Dolan
Journalist
The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner

Professor Paul Doty
Center for Science and International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard Universi[illegible]

Father Robert F. Drinan
Former Member of Congress
Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center

The Honorable Lawrence S. Eagleburger
Former Under Secretary of State
President, Kissinger Associates

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Former Mayor of San Francisco

Ms. Randall Forsberg
Executive Director, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies

The Honorable Henry H. Fowler
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Dr. Marvin Goldberger
Director, Institute for Advanced Study

The Honorable Arthur A. Hartman
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Andrew Heiskell
Former Chairman of the Board, TIME Incorporated

The Honorable Richard Helms
Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency
President, Safeer Company

National Council

The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh
President Emeritus, University of Notre Dame

Mr. Arnold L. Horelick
Director, RAND/UCLA Program in Soviet International Behavior
RAND Corporation

Dr. Matina Horner
President, Radcliffe College

The Honorable William H. Hudnut, III
Mayor of Indianapolis

Professor Samuel P. Huntington
Director, Center for International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

*The Honorable William J. Hyland
Former Deputy Special Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs
Editor, Foreign Affairs

Admiral B. R. Inman
Former Director, National Security Agency

General David C. Jones
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

*The Honorable Amos A. Jordan
Former Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
President and Chief Executive Officer
Center for Strategic and International Studies

Professor Barbara Jordan
Former Member of Congress
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin

The Honorable George F. Kennan
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.
The Institute for Advanced Study

The Honorable Juanita Kreps
Former Secretary of Commerce
Professor of Economics, Duke University

Admiral Gene R. La Rocque
Director, Center for Defense Information

Lt. General Richard D. Lawrence, U.S. Army (ret.)
Former President, National Defense University
Cambridge International

Ms. Flora Lewis
Foreign News Columnist
The New York Times

*Dr. Walter E. Massey
Vice President for Research
and for Argonne National Laboratory
The University of Chicago

*The Honorable David Mathews
Former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare
President, Charles F. Kettering Foundation

*The Honorable Charles McC. Mathias
Former Senator, State of Maryland
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue

The Honorable David E. McGiffert
Former Assistant Secretary of Defense
Covington & Burling

The Honorable Donald McHenry
Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service

The Honorable Robert S. McNamara
Former Secretary of Defense

*General Edward C. Meyer
Former Army Chief of Staff

The Honorable Patsy T. Mink
Former Member of Congress
Honolulu City Council

Ms. Nancy M. Neuman
Chair, League of Women Voters

Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr.
Former Deputy to the Under Secretary of State
Director, Center for Science and International Affairs
John F. Kennedy School of Government

Professor Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.
President, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis

Dr. Sally K. Ride
National Aeronautics and Space Administration

*Dr. Alice M. Rivlin
Director, Economic Studies Program
The Brookings Institution

The Honorable George Romney
Former Governor of the State of Michigan

Professor Eugene V. Rostow
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law and Diplomacy
National Defense University

Mr. William M. Roth
President, Roth Properties

Mr. John Sawhill
Director, McKinsey & Company

Professor Robert Scalapino
Department of Political Science
University of California at Berkeley

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Dr. William Schneider
Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute
for Public Policy Research

Mr. Bernard L. Schwartz
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Loral Corporation

Mr. Albert Shanker
President, American Federation of Teachers

National Council

Dr. John R. Silber
President, Boston University

The Honorable William E. Simon
Former Secretary of the Treasury

Mr. Walter Slocombe
Former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
Caplin & Drysdale

The Honorable Gerard C. Smith
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
President, The Consultants International Group

Major General Perry M. Smith, U.S.A.F. (ret.)
Former Commandant, National War College

The Honorable Helmut Sonnenfeldt
Former Counselor to the Secretary of State
Guest Scholar, Foreign Policy Studies

Mr. Edson W. Spencer
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Honeywell

Mr. Kenneth A. Steadman
Director, National Security and Foreign Affairs
Veterans of Foreign Wars

*Dr. Howard R. Swearer (Chairman, Executive Committee)
President, Brown University

Mr. Robert Teeter
President, Market Opinion Research

Dr. Lewis Thomas
President Emeritus, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

The Honorable Richard Thornburgh
Former Governor of the State of Pennsylvania

Major General Harold W. Todd
Commandant
Air War College
Air University

Professor Robert W. Tucker
School of Advanced International Studies
The Johns Hopkins University

Admiral Stansfield Turner
Former Director, Central Intelligence Agency

Professor Adam B. Ulam
Director, Russian Research Center
Harvard University

*The Honorable Cyrus R. Vance
Former Secretary of State and Deputy Secretary of Defense
Chairman, The Public Agenda Foundation
Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett

Dr. Frank E. Vandiver
President, Texas A&M University

General Wilma L. Vaught, U.S.A.F. (ret.)
Advisor, The Jane Addams Conference
on Security in the Nuclear Age

The Honorable Arlene Violet
Former Attorney General of the State of Rhode Island

Ms. Jane Wales
Director, The Security Options Project

The Honorable Paul C. Warnke
Former Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
Clifford and Warnke

*The Honorable Thomas J. Watson, Jr.
Former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R.
Chairman Emeritus, IBM Corporation

Mr. Fred Wertheimer
President, Common Cause

Mr. Tom Wicker
Political Columnist
The New York Times

The Honorable R. James Woolsey
Former Under Secretary of the Navy
Shea & Gardner

National Council

*Mr. Daniel Yankelovich
President, The Public Agenda Foundation
Chairman, The Daniel Yankelovich Group, Inc.

The Honorable Coleman Young
Mayor of Detroit

*Executive Committee member

THE PUBLIC, THE SOVIETS, AND NUCLEAR ARMS:
PUBLIC SUMMIT '88

PUBLICATIONS

The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms: An Information Kit (1987). Describes the multi-year joint effort of Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development to explore and enhance the public's role in development of the country's long term policies for nuclear arms and U.S. Soviet relations. Includes information about Public Summit '88, a citizen information campaign conducted in cooperation with local television and newspapers in four cities in January 1988. Single copies available free of charge.

The Public, The Soviets, and Nuclear Arms: A Perspective from Community Leaders (1987). Report on a series of workshops held with community leaders in ten cities examining issues such as deterrence, the Strategic Defense Initiative, and the spread of Marxism in the Third World. Conducted as part of the joint project between Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development. 62pp. Price: $10.00.

Voter Options on Nuclear Arms Policy: A Briefing Book for the 1984 Elections (1984). Part of the joint project between Public Agenda and Brown University's Center for Foreign Policy Development. Report based on a 1984 indepth study of Americans' views about nuclear arms, the Soviets, arms control, and communism in the Third World, and an analysis of opinion data on these issues since 1945. Outlines areas of consensus and confusion among Americans and contrast public opinion, elite views and existing policy options. 90pp. Price: $6.00. Technical Appendix: $10.00.

U.S.-Soviet Relations in the Year 2010: Americans Look to the Future (1988). Final report on a research study of nearly one thousand citizens on the future of U.S.-Soviet relations, conducted jointly by the Public Agenda Foundation and the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University. 120pp. Price $10.00. Technical Appendix: Forthcoming. Also available, summary ballot results from Public Summit '88, the joint citizen information campaign of Public Agenda and the Center for Foreign Policy Development, and conducted in cooperation with local television stations and newspapers in four cities across the country. Price: $5.50.

Public Agenda Foundation, 6 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016 212 · 686 · 6610
Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University, Box 1948, Providence, Rhode Island 02912 401 · 863 · 3465